National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. Without Concealment---Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, COR. EDITORS.

VOL. XII. NO. 45. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1852. WHOLE NO. 617.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & Johnston, printers.

Selections.

EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH

OF HON. HENRY WILSON, IN THE MASSACHUSETTS SENATE.

BUT the Senator does not comprehend the phrase "Democratic Democrats." Well, I will try to enlighten the Senator. When I speak of Democratic Democrats, I mean men who sincerely believe that all men of every climate and race are created free and equal—that the humblest man who walks the earth is a man and a brother, whom God made, and for whom Christ died—men who cordially accept the sublime doctrine of Democratic Liberty—equality and fraternity without qualification or reservation; men whose sympathies are always with oppressed men, struggling for their inalienable rights; men who welcome the poor, panting bondmen, fleeing from the lash and the chain of Slavery with the same cordiality with which they welcome the great Hungarian from the lost fields of European Liberty and loathe the oppression that exiled the one, as they do the Austrian tyranny that imprisoned and banished the other—men who look to the future with trusting hope and abiding confidence in the onward progress of the race. Does the Senator like the definition?

The Senator gives the party with which I act, the designation of the "streaked and speckled" party. I won't question the Senator's taste. As the Senator was once the god father of the party, we must allow him to put in his claim to christen it. In 1838, the distinguished Senator represented Bristol in the Senate, and many persons knowing his brilliant qualities, looked upon him as the successor of John Reed, in Congress. A series of resolutions was reported by the late James C. Alvord. Those resolutions declared that Congress has the power to abolish Slavery in the territories.

The power to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and that it ought to exercise its power.

The power to abolish the slave trade between the States and that it ought to exercise it.

The power to prevent the admission into the Union of a slave State and it ought to exercise it, and the power to abolish Slavery in the District.

When these resolutions came up for consideration, the Senator would not be content with the report of the committee. Such was his horror of Slavery that it was not enough for him to declare the power of Congress to abolish Slavery in the District. He moved to amend the resolutions by adding the following:

Resolved, That Congress ought to take measures to effect the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

The resolution was adopted, and these resolutions pledging Massachusetts and the Whig party to the agitation of the Slavery question were passed by the unanimous vote of the Senate. These resolutions embody the cardinal question of the creed of the Free Soil party, the "streaked and speckled" party the Senator sneers at. These resolutions were for twelve years the cardinal principle of the Whigs of Massachusetts. Masschusetts, thank God, stands upon them now, and there she will continue to stand, although the Senator and other great Whig leaders have repudiated them and given in their adhesion to the "finality" of the Compromises.

The Senator voted that Congress ought to take measures to effect the abolition of Slavery in the District; the compromises consider the Slavery question finally settled, and, that all agitation and discussion must cease.

Then the Senator could not be outdone in his zeal for Anti-Slavery agitation; now he embraces the compromise and claims community of sentiment with my colleague (Mr. Beard) in devotion to the support of the compromise; Fugitive Slave Law and all. The Senator sees nothing "speckled and streaked" in the association I suppose.

Mr. President, in the Spring of 1836 I spent a few weeks in Washington; I saw the first gag-law forced through Congress; I saw that Slavery moved the public councils; I saw men chained in the Capital of the Republic; I saw the slave pen, where men, women and children were sold, to wear out their existence in the far South West; I heard angry debates in Congress, growing out of the Texas question, and I came home determined to use the little influence I possessed in favour of Liberty; and from that day to this I never saw a moment when I would not sacrifice my own or my party's interest, if by so doing I could hasten the cause of emancipation. Finding the Whig party committed to the cause of Liberty by the resolution of 1838, I joined the ranks of that party, and voted with them in the election of that year. Who have faltered? The men who stand square upon the resolutions of 1838, or the men who now stand by the compromises?

Mr. President, the Senator asks with an air of assumed triumph, if I "wore the spurs into the Philadelphia Convention when I voted for Mr. Webster." Sir, I thank the Senator for affording me an opportunity to place that matter right before the Senate.

In the winter of 1845, when the Texas question was pending before Congress, a State Convention was called in Faneuil Hall, without party distinction. Mr. Webster united in the Convention with Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Edmund Quincy, Joshua Leavitt, my friend from Middlesex (Mr. Sewall), Charles Allen, John G. Palfrey, Stephen C. Phillips, Charles Francis Adams and Linus Child, (who, by the way, threatened to raise the war cry of "Abolition or Repeal," if Texas was admitted by joint resolution, but who has recently contented himself with declaring his purpose to turn out of the Boott Mills any workman who should vote the ten hours, coalition ticket). Mr. Webster consulted with and assisted Stephen C. Phillips, and Charles F. Adams, in preparing the Address of the Convention—an address filled with noble sentiments of hostility to Slavery domination—an address worthy of that magnificent assemblage of Massachusetts "Abolitionists and agitators." Then Mr. Webster was with the men who represented the voice of the ancient Commonwealth. Where was the Senator from Suffolk then? With Mr. Webster and the men who stood by the Senator's resolution of 1838 against admitting a slave State? No, sir, no! The Senator was then with a class of men who began at that time to falter and waver. Mr. Webster afterwards designated this class of men as "Optimists" and "Quietists," with whom it was always too early or too late to resist slaveholding aggressions. Mr. Webster stood upon the platform of Massachusetts Free Soilism, embodied in the resolutions of 1838, which the Senator from Suffolk and the Senator from Hampshire supported. We had not then discovered the "sectional" character of the platform; but the Senator from Suffolk, being one of the framers, had begun to show symptoms of "nationality."

At the Whig State Convention at Springfield, in 1847, Mr. Webster being present, begging a Presidential nomination, claimed a patent for the Wilmot proviso "thunder," on the plea of "priority of discovery." The Senator from Norfolk (Mr. Keyes) will remember the patentee process. That sagacious politician, Charles Francis Adams, expressed his fears that the patentee would lose the patent by a "non user." About this time, as my young friend and colleague from Middlesex (Mr. Burlingame) will remember, several young Whigs, not of the "Optimist and Quietist" school, met Mr. Webster at the Tremont House, where they received the most complete assurances that he was in full communion with them in their abolitionism. In the Spring of 1848, these enthusiastic young men formed a Webster Club. I believe I was voted in as a member of that club on motion of my friend from Middlesex (Mr. Burlingame). These young men were enthusiasts of liberty, and they looked to Mr. Webster as the giant intellect that was to combine and lead on the lovers of freedom. He was the apostle of their faith. To use the eloquent language of my friend, "these young men would have gone through fire and water for his sake; at his suggestion they took an advanced position in '48 and held it, thank God, though he left them alone to be shattered."

As the day for the National Convention drew nigh, it was apparent that the South, aided by the "Optimists and Quietists" of the North, intended to force Gen. Taylor upon the Whig party, unpledged to the Wilmot proviso. The day I left for the Convention, I met, in Court street, one of Mr. Webster's friends, who informed me that several of those friends were assembled in Mr. Webster's office, and were anxious to see me. I accompanied him to the office, where I found various members of the Webster Club, among them my friend from Middlesex (Mr. Burlingame), and Mr. Webster's son. These gentlemen were somewhat excited. The *Atlas* had hinted that Taylor might be nominated, and the distinguished gentleman who now represents the country at the Court of St. James, might be nominated for the Vice Presidency. M. Lawrence not only belonged to the school of the "Optimists and Quietists," but it was a piece of assurance in him and his friends, to dream that there could be more than one man in Massachusetts, while the patentee of the Wilmot Proviso "thunder" lived! They wished to know what I and the "conscience Whigs" with whom I acted, intended to do. I told them I had written to Mr. Webster, that the section of the Whig party with whom I acted would not vote for General Taylor unless he was pledged to the Wilmot Proviso—that I could not vote for Mr. Webster if he used his influence directly or indirectly to aid Taylor's nomination. I told them if Taylor was committed to the Proviso, I should vote for him, although a slaveholder; but if he was forced upon the party unpledged to the doctrine of Massachusetts, I should leave the Convention and go into opposition. These gentlemen assured me—my colleague will correct me if I am wrong—that Mr. Webster had said that he "would never recommend the people to support for President an ignorant, swearing, frontier-Colonel"—they assured me "Mr. Webster was with us"—told me "to go ahead and they would back me."

I left the office, and went directly to Philadelphia, where I found a note from Mr. Webster, giving me ample assurances, and referring me to his friend, one of the delegates from this State, for his opinions. Having received ample assurance from Mr. Webster, I voted for him; although I knew then, as now, that his chances were desperate.

But, sir, where was the Senator from Suffolk then? Not with Mr. Webster, nor with the men who stood by the resolutions of 1838. He was one of the chiefs of the "Optimists and Quietists." Rumour said he had made a tour to the "Old Dominion" to secure the nomination of his *then* friend, Mr. Lawrence, for the Vice Presidency. Rumour also whispered that Mr. Webster looked rather frowningly upon the course of the Senator. Mr. Warren said that rumour lied then. I am glad of it, sir, for the frowns of the great Secretary are said to be very chilling. My colleague will remember the rumour. (Mr. Burlingame nodded assent.)

Such, sir, was Mr. Webster's opinion in 1848, when I voted for him. Gen. Taylor was nominated on the 9th of June—on the 28th of that month one of the largest Conventions ever assembled in Massachusetts, met at Worcester. There and then the organization of the Free Soil party was begun, and their principles were proclaimed. Many of Mr. Webster's friends attended, among them his son. They urged us to speak kindly of Mr. Webster, assuring us that he was with us. The Convention expressed confidence in him and called upon him to lead the friends of freedom. A few days after I called on Mr. Webster at his own request at his office. He expressed his cordial assent to the principles of the Convention, and his respect for and confidence in the members of the Convention. He said if we would make a public sentiment that would sustain public men in being true to the sentiments of the North, we should accomplish everything, for we had always been beaten by the treachery of Northern men. Yes, sir, Mr. Webster stood with us upon the principles afterwards embodied in the Buffalo platform, and it was not until after that Convention had selected another man to embody its principles that he came out for the "nomination not fit to be made."

Then the Senator from Suffolk was not among his "list of friends," but now, after Mr. Webster has abandoned his former principles, and gone over to the Slave Power, the Senator leaves the "Optimists and Quietists" and follows the great Secretary. He is not the man to read me lectures about consistency. Mr. Webster is the brain, the heart, if it have a heart, the soul, if it have a soul, of Millard Fillmore's administration, an administration of which one of the most active Whigs of the country declared, in a speech in this city within one year, "No Whig could have any influence with it unless he was BATHED IN NEGROES' BLOOD." Surely, sir, the declaration of the Senator that "he was glad the authorities of Boston put chains about the Court House," will be grateful to an administration which demands that its friends shall be "BATHED IN NEGROES' BLOOD."

Mr. President, the Senator goes out of his way to assail Charles Sumner. This assault is aimed I suppose at the coalition which placed that gentleman in the United States Senate. While the election was pending the Senator and his friends denounced Mr. Sumner as a "fanatic," "disunionist," and "firebrand." Sir, Mr. Sumner has taken up the business of the Senate in its course as his friends knew he would do. On the public land question he has made a speech destined to exert a powerful influence upon the country, a speech received with marked approbation by the teeming millions west of the Alleghanies, and by thousands on the Atlantic slope, a speech that will tend to strengthen the ties of sentiment and interest of the free millions of the East and the West. Sir, I tell the Senator from Suffolk that when the question of Slavery comes before Congress, Charles Sumner's voice will utter the living sentiments of Massachusetts for freedom, and his vote will never be false to her ancient principles. His voice and his vote will ever be where his heart is, in favour of freedom, peace and progress. His voice and his vote will always be in favour of those great Democratic ideas, the realization of which will make our country great and glorious among the nations, a country to which the friends of freedom will turn with hope and admiration.

RACHEL PARKER.—In our 24th number, under the Summary of News, notice was taken of a resolution of our Legislature, authorizing the Governor to employ counsel, on the part of the State, on behalf of this girl, who was abducted, without process of law, and carried from Chester county, Pennsylvania, to Baltimore, where she is understood to be in prison awaiting her trial as an alleged fugitive slave. We understand that two members of the profession have been selected by the Governor to appear in her defence on behalf of the State.

There is one aspect of this case which does not seem to have attracted the notice which its importance fairly demands, as this may be made a precedent for others of even greater atrocity. It is understood that the case is to be tried in Maryland, where, of course, all who may attend, either as spectators or witnesses, must be subject to Maryland law. Now, before adverting to the difficulty of producing coloured witnesses before a Maryland tribunal, and such are the witnesses most likely to be intimately acquainted with her birth and lineage, let us inquire by what right her freedom can be questioned before any tribunal out of Pennsylvania. Her residence was in Chester county, and, if she was claimed as a slave, Pennsylvania was the place where the question could be legally decided. Witnesses, if any existed to prove her Slavery, might safely come into our State from Maryland, or any where else. If her forcible removal, without any process of law, from Pennsylvania into Maryland, can legally subject her to the necessity of being adjudged a slave, unless she can produce satisfactory evidence of her freedom before a tribunal there, it is no easy matter to show why she might not have been carried to South Carolina or Texas, and required to prove her freedom there, or remain a slave for life.

By the law of Maryland, a negro or mulatto going into the State from any other, no matter how short the continuance there, is liable to a fine of twenty dollars, and in case of neglect or refusal to pay this fine, he or she is to be sold to the highest bidder. Whether coloured witnesses going from Chester county into Maryland to prove the freedom of this girl, would be brought under the operation of this law, is a question not easily decided in advance. I, however, do not discover, in the provision of the law, any exceptions in their favour. At all events, the subjugation of her witnesses to the inconvenience, if not the danger of going into another State, to prove what ought to be determined at home, is giving to the claimant of the girl an advantage springing from an unauthorized act of violence, totally irreconcileable with the maxim of English law, that no man is to take advantage from his own wrong.

Let Rachel Parker be first brought, by habeas corpus, to the county from which she was abducted, and there let the alleged master vindicate his claim. —[*Phila.*] *Friends' Review.*

AMERICAN COLONISATION SOCIETY.

"WE remarked in a previous article, that colonisation is 'the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day;' and we reiterate the assertion, and challenge denial."—*Portage Co. Whig, Feb.* 25.

That we may fully appreciate the *force* of the foregoing "assertion," we will enquire how much "the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day" has accomplished.

The American Colonisation Society was organized in 1817, *thirty-five years ago*. We learn, from an extract from the Message of Gov. Hunt, of New York, published in the *Whig*, that "under the auspices of this Society, *nearly* 10,000 *free coloured persons* have emigrated, *many of them* being slaves liberated on that condition."

How many of this ten thousand were "liberated on that condition" (there being removed by the Colonisation Society to Liberia), we cannot tell. But perhaps it may approximate towards the truth to say one half of that number, which would be five thousand in thirty-five years. Let us now see what impression "the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day" is likely, at this rate, to make upon Slavery.

In 1810, the number of slaves in the United States was 1,191,364. In 1820 the number was 1,538,064—making an average yearly increase of 34,670, for ten years, which would make the slave population, in 1817, the year in which the Colonisation Society was organized, 1,434,054.

By the census of 1850, the number of slaves in the United States appears to be 3,198,324—increase since 1817, 1,764,270.

It will be seen that in less than 35 years, the slave population has increased nearly *two millions*, while during the same period "the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day" has not influenced the liberation probably of over 5000 slaves. At this rate we would like to have our friend of the *Whig* tell us how long it will take for his "successful emancipation plan" to abolish Slavery!

In 1817, the free coloured population was about 219,000—by the census of 1850, it was 428,661—nearly doubled in less than thirty-five years.

In 1817, the aggregate coloured population (free and slave) in the United States, was 1,643,449; in 1850, 3,626,985—increase nearly *two millions!* At this rate how long will it take the Colonisation Society to bless and benefit the coloured population of our country, with *freedom from oppression and prejudice!*

We have not here taken into account, at all, the fact, that probably over two millions of the coloured population have gone down to the grave, while the Society has been busied in expatriating 10,000.

Admitting the Colonisation Society to be an "Emancipation plan"—the foregoing statistical view of the subject fully disposes of the "challenge" of the *Whig*, and shows the absurdity of its pretensions. If the object *was* emancipation, it is seen, as a plan of emancipation, it is wholly worthless. And here we might well leave the *Whig* to the derisive ridicule which its puerile assumption has produced.

But we go further and deny that the Colonisation Society is, or was ever intended to be by its prominent founders, *an emancipation Society at all!* And this position we shall not rest upon mere "assertion," but shall fortify it with *proof!*

The Colonisation scheme was the conception of slaveholders. Instead of being an emancipation plan, it was a plan devised especially to benefit Slavery. The proximity of free negroes was a source of apprehension and annoyance to slaveholders. There were also vicious and superannuated slaves, whose presence was pernicious and burdensome. The wish, therefore, to get rid of free negroes, and vicious and worn out slaves, gave birth to the American Colonisation Society. Mr. Clay and other slaveholders were among its projectors. Its constitution was framed cautiously, so as to operate only on free coloured persons—the idea of abolishing Slavery, entered not at all into its organic law. A negro, before he can receive the patronage of the Society, *must be free!*

We are well aware, that while slaveholders represented the Society as the handmaid of Slavery, it was claimed at the North to be an Anti-Slavery Society, thus presenting a Janus face, and deceiving many. But long since has its deceptive policy been exposed, and it is now left for socialists, like him of the *Whig*, to claim, at this late day, that it is "the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day."

We now offer proof to show that the American Colonisation Society is not, and was not designed to be, an emancipation Society. Our proof is drawn from the *African Repository*, the organ of the Society.

"It is far from the intention of this Society to effect, in any manner, the tenure by which a certain species of property is held."—*Henry Clay.*

"From its origin, and throughout the whole period of its existence, it has constantly disclaimed all intention of interfering, in the smallest degree, with the rights of property, or the object of emancipation, gradual or immediate. * * * The Society presents to the American public no 'project of emancipation."—*Idem.*

"He thought it necessary to show, that so far from being in the smallest degree connected with the abolition of Slavery, the proposed society would prove one of the greatest securities to enable the master to keep in possession his own property."—*Randolph's Speech.*

"It is no abolition Society; it addresses, as yet, arguments to no master. It denies the design of attempting emancipation, either partial or general."—*African Repository, Vol.* 3, *p.* 197.

"The Colonisation Society, as such, have renounced wholly the name and characteristics of Abolitionists. In this point they have been unjustly and injuriously slandered. Into their accounts, the subject of emancipation does not enter at all."—*Idem. p.* 306.

"Recognising the constitutional and legitimate existence of Slavery, it seeks not to interfere, either directly or indirectly, with the rights which it creates. Acknowledging the necessity by which its present continuance, and the rigorous provisions for its maintenance, are justified, &c."—*Idem. Vol.* 3. *p.* 16.

"To eradicate or remove the evil immediately, is impossible, nor can any law of conscience govern necessity."—*Vol.* 1, *p.* 151.

The scope of the Society is large enough but it is nowise mingled or confounded with the broad sweeping views of a few fanatics in America, who would urge us on to the sudden and total abolition of Slavery."—*Vol.* 3, *p.* 197.

"The emancipation of slaves or the amelioration of their condition, with the moral, intellectual, and political improvements of people of colour within the United States, are objects foreign to the powers of this Society."—*Address of the Board of Managers, of the American Colonisation Society, to its Auxiliary Societies.—Vol.* 7, *p.* 291.

"Our Society and the friends of Colonisation wish to be distinctly understood upon this point. From the beginning they have disavowed, and they do yet disavow, that their object is the emancipation of the slaves."—*Speech of James S. Green, Esq., before the New Jersey Colonisation Society.*

From the same source we might adduce proof to show that the Society is the apologist of Slavery, the traducer of the blacks, that it recognises slaves as property, that its influence is calculated to increase their value, that it sanctions keeping them in ignorance, and tends to render Slavery perpetual. But these things being foreign to the precise point in hand, we omit them for the present, and leave our neighbour, in his new born Colonisation zeal, to digest the foregoing.—*The Ohio (Ravenna) Star.*

THE COLONISATION WHIG.

WE have but a few more words to say, at present, in reference to the new-born zeal of our neighbour of the *Whig*. Nor is this necessary. Nearly every position he has assumed, he has abandoned—but clings, nevertheless, with blind desperation, to the fortunes of the old *Colonisation Society*, and as a dernier resort, seizes with convulsive grasp upon the *New York Observer* as his sheet anchor, and, *perhaps*, feels safe!

He claims, first, that Mr. Birney has lately "given in his adhesion" to the scheme of Colonisation—the week following, he admits that "*Mr. Birney does not endorse the Colonisation Society!*"

He claims that "Colonisation is the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day"—and the next week admits that "*the primary object of the Colonisation Society is not to abolish Slavery!*"

He very confidently asserted that "Colonisation was the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day," and quite arrogantly "challenged denial." We accepted the challenge, and now, the *Whig*, substantially admitting all our propositions and positions, attempts to cover the weakness of its own ill-considered assumptions, and beats a retreat under a species of misty special pleading. The *Whig* says: "When we said that Colonisation was the most successful emancipation plan of our land and day, *we of course meant that &c.*" O, yes! you of course meant *something else!* You "of course" didn't mean what you said!!

The *Whig* is disingenuous. It is impossible to have a fair discussion with such an opponent.

The *Whig* says:

"We imagine that it is entirely too late in this day for the *Star* to excite hostility to the Colonisation movement, by alledging that it is the 'traducer of the blacks,' that it 'sanctions keeping them in ignorance,' that it 'tends to render Slavery perpetual,' and other like assertions."

We did say that the Colonisation *Society* was the "traducer of the blacks," &c. And what we *alleged*, or *asserted*, we are ready to prove. We make no attempt at evasion, by claiming that we "of course" meant something else!

We will now subjoin proof to sustain our positions, drawn from the Reports of the Parent Society and its Auxiliaries, and speeches of Colonisationists, as recorded in the *African Repository*, the official organ of the American Colonisation Society.

We adduce these proofs, not on account of the *Whig*, or out of respect to it, for we have ceased to look for fairness from that quarter. But, as an effort is being made to re-instate the Old Colonisation Society in public confidence, for the purpose of refreshing the memory of our older, and giving facts to our younger readers, who may never have investigated these things, we give the following extracts, and claim for them a careful consideration. The Colonisation Society has not changed. What it was in the beginning it is now.

For the principles and views of the Society we must look to its own statements and admissions; to its Annual Reports; to those of its Auxiliaries; to the speeches and writings of its advocates; and to its organ, the *African Repository*.

1. *It excuses Slavery and apologises for slaveholders.*

PROOF. "Slavery is an evil entailed upon the present generation of slaveholders, which they must suffer, whether they will or not!"—*African Rep. vol.* 5. *p.* 179. "The existence of Slavery among us, *though not at all to be objected to our Southern brethren as a fault*," &c.—*Ann. Rep. of N. Y. Col. Soc.* "It (the Society) condems no man because he is a slaveholder."—*African Rep.* "Recognising the constitutional and legitimate existence of *Slavery*, it seeks not to interfere, either directly or indirectly, with the *rights* it creates. *Acknowledging the necessity by which its present continuance, and the rigorous provisions for its maintenance are justified*," &c.—*African Rep., Vol.* 3. *p.* 16. "They (the Abolitionists) confound the *misfortunes* of one generation with the *crimes* of another, and would sacrifice both individual and public good to *an unsubstantial theory of the rights of man!!*"—*African Rep. Vol.* 7., *p.* 202.

2. *It pledges itself not to oppose the System of Slavery.*

PROOF. "Our Society and the friends of Colonisation wish to be distinctly understood upon this point. From the beginning they have *disavowed*, and they do yet *disavow*, that their object is *the emancipation of slaves*."—*Speech of James S. Green, Esq.*—*Annual Report of the N. Jersey Col. Society.*

"This institution proposes to do good by a specific course of measures. Its direct and specific purpose is not *the abolition of Slavery* or the relief of pauperism, or the extension of commerce and civilization, or the enlargement of science, or of the conversion of the heathen. The single object which its constitution prescribes, and to which all its efforts are necessarily directed, is African colonization from America. It proposes only to afford facilities for the voluntary emigration of the free people of colour from this country to the country of their fathers." *Review of African Colonisation.—Christian Spectator.*

"*It is no abolition Society;* it addresses as yet *arguments to no master*, and disavows with horror the idea of offering temptations to any slave. *It denies the design of attempting emancipation, either partial or general.*"—'The Colonisation Society Vindicated.'—African Rep. vol. iii p. 197.

"The Colonisation Society, as such, have renounced wholly the name and the characteristics of Abolitionists. On this point they have been unjustly and injuriously slandered. *Into their accounts the subject of emancipation does not enter at all.*"—N. E.—Idem. p. 306.

"From its origin, and throughout the whole period of its existence, it has constantly disclaimed all intention of interfering in the smallest degree, with the rights of property, or the *object of emancipation*, GRADUAL or immediate." * * * "The Society presents to the American public no 'project of emancipation."—Mr. Clay's Speech.—Idem. vol. vi. pp. 13, 17.

"The emancipation of slaves or the amelioration of their condition, with the moral, intellectual, and political improvement of people of colour within the United States, are objects foreign to the powers of this Society."—Address of the Board of Managers of the Am. Col. Soc. to its Auxiliary Societies.—Idem, vol. vii. p. 291.

"The Society, as a society, recognises no principles in reference to the slave-system. It says nothing, and proposes to do nothing, respecting it." * * * "So far as we can ascertain, the supporters of the colonisation policy generally believe, that Slavery is in this country a constitutional and legitimate system, which they have no inclination, interest nor ability to disturb."—North Am. Review, for July 1832.

3. IT REGARDS GOD'S RATIONAL CREATURES AS PROPERTY.

PROOF. "We hold their slaves as we hold their other property, SACRED."—African Rep. v i. p. 283.

"It is equally plain and undeniable that the Society, in the prosecution of this work, has never interfered or evinced even a disposition to interfere in any way with the rights of proprietors of slaves."—Idem. vol. vi. p. 205.

"To the slave-holder, who has charged upon them the wicked design of interfering with the rights of property under the specious pretext of removing a vicious and dangerous free population, they address themselves in a tone of conciliation and sympathy. We know your rights, say they, and we respect them."—Idem. vol. vii p. 100.

4. IT BOASTS THAT ITS MEASURES ARE CALCULATED TO PERPETUATE THE DETESTED SYSTEM OF SLAVERY —TO REMOVE THE FEARS OF THE SLAVEHOLDER, AND INCREASE THE VALUE OF HIS STOCK OF HUMAN BEINGS.

PROOF. "They (the Southern slaveholders) will contribute more effectually to the continuance and strength of this system (Slavery) by removing those now free, than by any or all other methods which can possibly be devised." — African Rep. vol. i., p. 227.

"So far from being connected with the abolition of Slavery, the measure proposed would be one of the greatest securities to enable the master to keep in possession his own property."—Speech of John Randolph, at the first meeting of the Colonisation Society.

"The tendency of the scheme, and one of its objects, is to secure slaveholders, and the whole Southern country, against certain evil consequences growing out of the present three-fold mixture of our population." — Address of the Rockbridge Col. Soc. African Rep. vol. iv. p. 274.

"There was but one way (to avert danger), but that might be made effectual, fortunately. It was TO PROVIDE AND KEEP OPEN A DRAIN FOR THE EXCESS BEYOND THE OCCASIONS OF PROFITABLE EMPLOMENT. Mr. Archer had been stating the case in the supposition, that after the present class of free blacks had been exhausted, by the operation of the plan he was recommending, others would be supplied for action, in the proportion of the excess of coloured population it would be necessary to throw off, by the process of voluntary manumission or sale. The effect must result inevitably from the depreciating value of the slaves, ensuing their disproportionate multiplication. The depreciation would be relieved and retarded at the same time, by the process. The two operations would aid reciprocally, and sustain each other, and both be in the highest degree beneficial. It was on the ground of interest, therefore, the most indisputable pecuniary interest, that he addressed himself to the people and Legislatures of the slaveholding States."—Speech of Mr. Archer.—Fifteenth Annual Report.

"The slaveholder, who is in danger of having his slaves contaminated by their free friends of colour, will not only be relieved from this danger, but THE VALUE OF HIS SLAVE WILL BE ENHANCED."—A new and interesting view of Slavery. By Humanitas, a colonisation advocate. Baltimore.

5. It denies the power of Christian Love to overcome an unholy prejudice against a portion of our fellow-creatures.

PROOF. "The Managers consider it clear that causes exist and are operating to prevent their (the blacks) improvement and elevation to any considerable extent, as a class, in this country, which are fixed, not only beyond the control of the friends of humanity, but of any human power. Christianity will not do for them here what it will do for them in Africa. This is not a fault of the coloured man, nor Christianity; but an ordinance of Providence, and no more to be changed than the laws of Nature!"—Annual Report of American Colonisation Society.

"The habits, the feelings, all the prejudices of society, prejudices which neither refinement, nor argument, nor education, NOR RELIGION ITSELF, can subdue, mark the people of colour, whether bond or free, as the subjects of a degradation inevitable and incurable. The African in this country belongs by birth to the very lowest station in society; and from that station HE CAN NEVER RISE, be his talents, his enterprise, his virtues what they may. * * * They constitute a class by themselves, a class out of which no individual can be elevated, and below which none can be depressed."—African Rep. vol. iv. pp. 118, 119.

"Is it not wise for the free people of colour and their friends to admit, what cannot reasonably be doubted, that the people of colour must, in this country, remain for ages, PROBABLY FOR EVER, a separate and inferior caste, weighed down by causes, powerful, universal, inevitable: which neither Legislation nor CHRISTIANITY can remove?"—Idem. vol. vii. p. 196.

6. It opposes strenuously the education of the blacks in this country, as useless, as well as dangerous.

PROOF. "If the free coloured people were generally taught to read, it might be an inducement to them to remain in this country (that is, in their native country!). We would offer them no such inducement." — Southern Religious Telegraph, Feb. 19, 1831.

"The public safety of our brethren at the South requires them (the slaves) to be kept ignorant and uninstructed."—G. P. Dissosway, Esq., an eminent Colonisationist.

"It is the business of the free (their safety requires it) to keep the slaves in ignorance. But a few days ago, a proposition was made in the Legislature of Georgia to allow them so much instruction as to enable them to read the Bible; which was promptly rejected by a large majority."—Proceedings of N. Y. State Colonisation Society at its second anniversary.

E. B. Caldwell, the first Secretary of the American Colonisation Society, in his speech at its formation, recommended them to be kept "in the lowest ssate of ignorance and degradation, for (says he) the nearer you bring them to the condition of brutes, the better chance do you give them of possessing their apathy.

7. It disparages, traduces, and persecutes the free blacks.

"Free blacks are a greater nuisance than even slaves themselves."—Af. Rep. vol. 2, p. 328.

"The free blacks in our country are, as a body, more vicious and degraded than any other which our population embraces."—Idem. vol. 5, p. 24.

"The increase of a black population among us has been regarded as a greater evil than the increase of slaves."—Idem. vol. 3, p. 374.

"Of all the descriptions of our population, and of either portion of the African race, the free people of colour are by far, as a class, the most corrupt, depraved and abandoned."—Idem. vol. 6, p. 12.

—Our limits will not admit of more extended extracts.

And now, we ask the candid reader, in view of the foregoing exhibit (and we would include our neighbour of the *Whig*, also, in this catagory, did we suppose we could get an ingenuous answer), whether the Colonisation Society is based upon, and whether Colonisationists are carrying out, through it, the great law of Christian love, "*Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.*"—*Ohio (Ohio) Star.*

A RUNAWAY SLAVE.

THERE is nothing like the practical operation of a statute to convince men of its worth or of its wickedness. It is an easy matter to theorize and talk coolly about the necessities or virtues of a proposed or passed law—when it comes into use; when it enters the village, the home, with all its stringent provisions, *then* comes the test—then men decide upon its merits or demerits.

Daniel Webster may tell us that we should conquer our prejudices; Dr. Dewey may give us the benefit of a "reflective conscience," and Congress may decide for us what are the legal rights of the South according to the Constitution—may force down our throats a Fugitive Slave Law, and, looking merely at the statute on paper, we may so forget the terrible realities contemplated by the law as to look calmly upon it. But only let us see and feel its workings, and then we shall awake to the hideousness of "the miscreant abomination."

A few days ago, we had the glorious privilege of breaking the accursed Fugitive Slave Law, and until that day when we saw the panting fugitive on his way to British soil, we had not *realized* the horrible features of the recent Fugitive Act. The slave before seemed not so much "a brother" and more "a chattel;" but when we gased upon the dark complexion of that image of God, and *saw* by his trembling fears that here in New England he was not safe from the man-hunter—then we realized the atrociousness of the law which makes it *penal* to help such an one—even with a glass of water or a crust of bread. He had escaped from the Algerines of the South, and—thank God!—wife and children, too, were with him! He needed "aid and comfort"—and what is more, he got it! Men who have never spoken Anti-Slavery words broke the Law. Expounders of the Law and of the Gospel helped him onward to Freedom and Canada. One man, whose name is a host among the friends of Freedom, took his coat from his own back and placed it upon that of the slave. No—there was not among all the apologists of the Slave Law, we dare say, a man who would have dared to blacken his soul with a crime so great, as that of betraying the poor fugitive. New England is not yet debased sufficiently to trample under foot God's great command, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you!" The poor slave to be sure was black, but he had flesh, muscles, and a heart, an immortal soul like all of us, and yet he was *afraid* right here in old Connecticut! Afraid of what!—afraid of the man-catchers—trembling for his wife and children lest the wretches, whom Rev. Drs. Dewey and Spring applaud, should force him and his little family back to Slavery! And we knew he was not safe here—he must fly to the protection of Old England! We saw then how low in the dust before the "dark spirit of Slavery" is New England. We have not freedom *here*, however it may be elsewhere—for we stand culprits in the eyes of law for giving to a brother—a glass of water! yet *we* talk harshly of oppression in France and Austria and Russia! And we have a population of *three millions* who would make old earth tremble with their shouts of joy, could they only stand to-morrow on the soil of Russia!

The fugitive is now, we trust, a man, on the cheerless but free shores of Canada; and we also trust, aye, know, that those who saw him and helped him on, though at the risk of their posessions, will never make a compromise with such a statute—as they value their souls. Men may differ from us as to the best means of removing Slavery, and possibly be good and honest; but he who would refuse to give shelter and sustenance to a weary, hunted human being, of whatever colour or clime, must be not simply unfeeling, but a positive miscreant. No *man*, no follower of Christ, under such circumstances, would refuse "aid and comfort."

—*Hartford Republican.*

Notice of "American Scenes and Christian Slavery," by the REV. EBENEZER DAVIES. [London, Snow.] From the London *Morning Advertiser.*

THIS is a volume of some 325 pages, written by Ebenezer Davies, formerly the pastor of a West Indian congregation composed in great part of persons of colour. The author, in the course of a tour of four thousand miles in the United States, had opportunities not often enjoyed by a British Abolitionist, for the observation of the system of Slavery; and we think it must be confessed by all, that he has not failed to improve them. Abolitionists on both sides of the Atlantic are too frequently pained by a change of tone which seems incident to a change of climate. Cox and Hoby, Reed and Matheson, Lyell and Joseph John Gurney, Frederika Bremer and Emmeline Stuart Wortley have all done more or less homage to the Slave Power, as they passed through the land over which it reigns. Nor is it wonderful that they should have bent the knee. By so doing, the traveller secures for himself the sympathy and aid of the most influential persons, and the entrée into the most cultivated society in the United States; while a contrary course subjects him to inconvenience and exclusion, which will go far to defeat his objects, whatever they may be. From the moment he touches the free Columbian soil, he is subjected to the same temptations which make it so difficult for Americans to be Abolitionists—the temptations of self-interest, of wordly success, and of social consideration. All that our American brethren possess of rank, or fashion, or of civil or ecclesiastical respectability, is devoted to the maintenance of their favourite institution, and consequently can never be permitted to irradiate the advocate of its victims.

Such being the facts of the case, it is no wonder that English travellers so often find their hereditary reverence for freedom failing them in the hour of need.

We can recollect at this moment but few names that have passed untarnished through this ordeal. Edward S. Abdy, who travelled about twenty years ago in the United States; George Thompson, the member for the Tower Hamlets, Harriet Martineau, the Earl of Carlisle, Charles Dickens, and the Rev. Ebenezer Davies are all that occur to us.

We wish the volume of Mr. Davies might be widely read. It cannot fail to do great good. Accurate, truthful, graphic, it at once rebukes the American and informs the Englishman. Candid, friendly, and impartial, it leaves nothing to be desired on the points which it undertakes to elucidate. It has much literary merit, and can boast of that clearness of style, power of description, and felicitous choice of adjectives which never can grace the pages of a man whose whole strength is spent in keeping something back. We particularly commend to the purchasers of this book the Sabbath scenes in New Orleans—a Slave Auction—the St. Louis Exchange—Contrast between the States of Ohio and Kentucky—Story of Pauline—The Negro Pew in Park-street church, Boston—and all the sketches of American divines.

We notice but one error in this book which requires correction; it is the idea that there are two Anti-Slavery parties in the United States—"both meaning well, but, unhappily, cherishing towards [against?] each other great bitterness of feeling!"

Now nothing is better understood in the United States than that the secession of Mr. Tappan from the American Anti-Slavery Society was neither well done nor well meant. It was a retrograde movement, back towards the pro-slavery world, not forward against Slavery. This is so thoroughly comprehended in Bennett's *Herald* and other pro-slavery journals, that they compliment Mr. Tappan and abuse the American Anti-Slavery Society in the same breath. It would be idle to waste time in the correction of a mistake which is of no consequence as regards the United States, the secession alluded to having long since perished in point of fact. But the unhappy mistake of the British and Foreign Anti-

dent of Charleston, South Carolina, and "a kind slaveholder," he defends the position of those who hold slaves from humane intentions, and thus gives their personal sanction to an "inherently corrupt" and wicked system. But Mr. Carpenter perpetually halts between two opinions. His horror of Slavery does not equal his gratitude to his entertainers—the slaveholders. The iron of Slavery does not enter into his own soul. He has no mother, no sister, no dear friend in Slavery. He coolly informs us there is "a place in Charleston where persons may, if they please, send slaves whom they deem refractory or dishonest." He does not explain that he means the calaboose, where anybody, for any offence, or none at all, may send any slave, male or female, and for a quarter of a dollar get the flesh peeled off the back till the blood lies in pools at the feet of the sufferer. If the slaveholders were merely sheep-stealers, we doubt whether Mr. Carpenter, with his English respect for the rights of property, would be so easily reconciled to the idea of a brother in the ministry who should emigrate to a region of sheep-stealers, settle among them as a preacher of the Gospel, and become a sheep stealer himself; or to one who saw nothing, or, if he did, said nothing, of anything in the Bible opposed to sheep-stealing; who though this proper mission towards sheep-stealing was that of silence; who denounced the opponents of sheep-stealing as fanatics; who clung to a political union with sheep-stealers with a view to political influence or national security. This pamphlet is full of place-boes to the consciences of slaveholders—to those who pursue the "mission of silence" respecting it; and to that vast class of Americans who esteem the maintenance of their union of such importance, that they not only scout the claims of their millions of bondsmen as of no account in comparison, but esteem him who loves and labours for impartial liberty as the worst enemy of their national existence. For example, in p. 60, he makes the strange assertion, that it is "better to be a slave than a prisoner." Had he said it would be better to be a slave than a criminal, there would be some truth in the remark. But a prisoner may be one of the noblest and happiest of our race. His mind may be free, and glory in the consciousness of its strength and uprightness.

"Stone walls do not a prison make,
Nor iron bars a cage."

The slave is the real prisoner—body and mind fettered and bound, except so far as a "kind" master may be pleased to make the chain a little less tight and galling; his duties, his rights, his conscience, all dictated to him; no will of his own; no wife, no child, no home, no legal right even to the clothes on his back. We have evils at home; let us never blink them. But Mr. Carpenter himself admits that two wrongs never made one right; and he well knew, though he does not seem feel, that nothing exists among us to compare in degree with this impious and studied attempt to erase the divine image and superscription from millions of God's children. He frequently makes mention of slaves as forming a part of his audience when in the South. What must have been his feelings when preaching to "chattels personal?" If he would exhort to the exercise of those virtues which are generally considered to adorn and dignify man, such as self-respect, purity, chastity, independence of mind, or the love of knowledge—he must have been checked by the conviction that all these were impossible to his hearers. He may preach patience—but he recollects that the patience of the slave is akin to servility; and hope—but it must be hope deferred; and gratitude—but here his tongue falters. We may gather from one fact, that Mr. C. found it a delicate matter to preach to these mixed congregations of slaves and their "owners." He tells us that when occupying Dr. Gilman's pulpit, in Charleston, he found that the prayer he had prepared for the day contained the passage "we would remember those in bonds as bound with them:" but, on the suggestion of Dr. G., he laid it aside for a more expurgated petition to the Divine Being, lest too much inflammable matter might be found lurking within the text. We do not envy the feelings of an English minister who, in deference to American Slavery, could thus consent to "restrain prayer before God." He may well query, "When will the day come when the religious sentiment of the South will resolve itself into religious action?"

We do not consider Mr. Carpenter a deliberate apologist for Slavery; but he does not seem to apprehend its enormity. In reading his pages we feel some of our own indignation gradually evaporate under his cold-blooded style of treating his subject; and we are obliged by an effort to remind ourselves that, notwithstanding Mr. Carpenter's mesmerism, Slavery is, indeed, "the sum of all villanies," one hour of which (as Jefferson declared) is more intolerable than ages of such tyranny as the fathers and heroes of the revolution arose to overthrow. These observations will be acceptable to those who "abhor Slavery in the abstract," and "are as much opposed to it as anybody," but still think it wisest and best, as it is certainly the easiest course, to *do* nothing against it, but let it die out of itself, and mind their own business. Like most other English travellers, he has only seen Slavery as it is permitted to appear before strangers, in its operations on the well fed, well clad house servants. He never entered a slave hut. He visited but one plantation, and then in the company of a jealous and watchful proprietor, a "determined Southerner." He tells us, that he admitted, in conversation with a slaveholder, that "he was disposed to believe there were few better fed peasantries anywhere." If he had ever read Wild's powerful and unrefuted *exposé* of *American Slavery as it is, or The Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses*, he would have had ample evidence that the food and clothing of the plantation slaves are often insufficient, and generally of the coarsest description. His admission was of course acceptable; but when Mr. C. objected that Slavery "made it a crime in the slave to look for what it was a sin for a man not to seek, liberty and education," the slaveholder declared that "the English could not understand their institutions." Coming from such a source, it is a valuable testimony to the Garrisonian Abolitionist, that, after objecting to the occasional want of good taste in their mode of expressing themselves, Mr. Carpenter admits that "they have laboured devotedly in a glorious cause. In the North there has been a decided advance, much of which must be attributed to their unceasing exertions; and, if they have done harm, good preponderates, as far as the cause of freedom is concerned. I honour their unflinching, self-sacrificing integrity, and those who discard all the ties of country for the slave's sake, deserve the sympathy of men of all countries." He means that they have identified themselves with the slave by their unceasing protests against his oppressors and their apologists, and by refusing to vote or hold office under the American constitution, which, as well as the American Churches, they consider a main bulwark of American Slavery, they cut themselves off from that political influence and activity which are as the breath of life to the great majority of that people. Referring to those who make use of political action in their opposition to Slavery, he remarks, "They will be liable to those temptations to sacrifice principle to expediency to which other parties have at times succumbed. From this insinuation, I must certainly except the Garrisonians, who, in a remarkable degree, sacrifice expediency to principle." When he qualifies his praise by alluding to the "harm" the Abolitionists have done, we presume Mr. C. refers to the discredit they feel it their duty to throw upon the religion of slaveholders and their apologists. Mr. C. himself confesses that, "unhappily, those who have set up for sanctity have been so cool about humanity, that the advocates of humanity are very suspicious of sanctity." One object has been achieved by these vehement Abolitionists: they have carried forward the war so boldly, that, under cover of their fire, many timid and cautious spirits are enabled safely and respectably to maintain a position far in advance of the ground they would otherwise have taken. In conclusion, we consider Mr. Carpenter's pamphlet a useful complement to existing Anti-Slavery literature, in the hands of those who are intimate with the bearings of the Anti-Slavery cause. As to those who are comparatively ill-informed or indifferent on this momentous subject, it is more likely to mystify than to instruct them, to paralyse than to awaken their sympathies.—(*London*) *Morning Advertiser.*

THE Charleston *Mercury* advises the citizens of South Carolina to decline any participation in the next election of President, as a matter in which the State has no concern. The Charleston *Standard* in the following paragraph, gives different counsels:

The present calm may prove deceitful, but we live in hope of a time of sober peace. When it shall come, with it comes also the time for inquiry into the prospects of the southern party. And here we will not disguise our belief, that the prospects of that party are gloomy enough for the present. Until some new emergency shall arise to stir it into action, its candidate for the Presidency could get only votes enough to expose its weakness. The failure of the convention in Alabama is manifest, and other States have not failed, only because they have not even ventured. We do not, therefore, expect another effort to rally a southern party upon present issues. All hope of a successful movement to that end, is dead, in the bosom of even the most sanguine. Divided councils at the south has done its work, and we must now be content to try the measure that is next best. What, then, is that measure? Simply this: we must support, as cordially as we can, the candidate for the Presidency whose most favourable to our interests.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

††† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1852.

EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will be held in the city of SYRACUSE, on TUESDAY, May 11th, at 10 o'clock, A. M., and will continue through the two following days Further particulars hereafter.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Pres.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, SYDNEY H. GAY, } Secretaries.

IF the Legislature of this State shall do nothing at its present session—and several of our political contemporaries, we observe, are complaining of such a probability—there is, at least, one portion of the people who will congratulate themselves that it has done no mischief. Should the action which it is proposed to take upon the subject of Colonisation, by the passage of a bill to extend aid to the "New York Liberia Emigration and Agricultural Association," come to naught, such a result would be cheaply purchased by the loss of every other good thing—if there were any—that it was hoped would be brought to pass at the present session by the assembled wisdom of the State.

The bill has already been before the Assembly, and has found its warm supporters, and, we believe, its luke-warm opponents, though, in the absence of anything but the most meagre reports of the debates on this point, it is not easy to ascertain precisely how the proposition was received. If that honourable body were moved by a love of justice and of right, or even were they governed by a sense of their duty under the Constitution, there would be no reason to apprehend the passage of any such law as that which is asked for: but as we know that legislative bodies are not always immaculate, and as we have some reason to fear that that now in session in Albany is not exempt from this general rule, we may not be surprised if it shall commit the State to a measure uncalled for by the people at large, unnecessary for those whom it pretends to aid, and unjust to all.

If it is carried at all, we know that it will be in the very face of the plainest facts, and in spite of the opposition of those who are most concerned in it. A memorial from a Committee of the most respectable and most influential coloured men of this city, has been laid before the members both of the Senate and the House, and in it are presented facts and arguments, which if disregarded, will be so because the Legislature is governed by hatred and contempt for the coloured race, and a desire to purchase the applause of their slaveholding masters, and not by a conscientious regard—if we may suggest such a possibility—for their oaths to office, and their duty to their constituents.

Let us look at these facts and arguments.

The petition of the Association asks for the appropriation of a large sum of money in aid of its purposes. The Memorialists against it beg the Legislature to pause before they pass the report which has been made in favour of this petition.

The petitioners themselves acknowledge that the proposition is opposed by the coloured people generally; and the Memorialists declare that where access has been had to those connected with it, they have all, with the exception of a few who are looking to some personal pecuniary advantage, abandoned it.

There is no assurance that any number of those in whose behalf this appropriation is asked will go to Africa; and if any did, there is no assurance that they will settle there permanently.

On the other hand, the Memorialists are certain that there are not six families in the State who would be willing to emigrate to Africa.

After two months earnest endeavour on the part of the Memorialists to ascertain precisely how many were connected with the Association pledged to emigration, they have only been able to learn of twelve persons positively so pledged.

The State Colonisation, moreover, has always stood ready and willing to aid all who wish to emigrate, for such is the purpose of the existence of that association.

But it will be seen by the reports of the New York State Colonisation Society for 1849, '50 and 51, that while they have received $50,547.58, they have expended from that amount but $1,784.34 for the transportation of Emigrants, as follows:

RECEIPTS.

In 1849,	$12,358.48
" 1850,	15,824.24
" 1851,	22,364.86
	$50,547.58

EXPENDED IN TRANSPORTING EMIGRANTS.

In 1849,	$677.48
" 1850,	253.87
" 1851,	852.99
	$1,784.38

And much of this amount has been used in transporting Emigrants not residents of this State.

The State Colonisation Society, moreover, has already given the Association $1,500, and stands pledged to give it further aid, when its members are ready to emigrate. That resource, therefore, of the Association should be shown to be inadequate to its wants, before it receives assistance from the State.

Such is the clear and unanswerable exposure of this new Colonisation swindle by the New York Committee of Thirteen, composed of such men as John I. Zuille, Phillip A. Bell, James McCune Smith, and others of like character and position. Will the Legislature disregard it? Will our readers in this State ask their representatives what they think of it?

TORONTO (CANADA) ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

WE learn from the *Toronto Globe*, that the Anti-Slavery Society of that city held its first Annual Meeting on Thursday evening of last week. The Chair was taken by the Rev. Dr. Willis, the President of the Society, and a Report read by Thomas Henning, Esq., the Secretary. The speakers were Rev. Dr. Burns, Rev. John Roaf, Rev. S. R. Ward, Rev. H. Eson, and Messrs. Geo. Brown, James Lesslie, Peter Freeland, R. H. Brett, Dr. Russell and others. A Telegraphic Dispatch says that the Report denounced the scheme of Liberia Colonisation, and invited the fugitive slaves to make their home in Canada. The *Globe* gives the following as the Resolution of the meeting:

1. Resolved, That while we deplore the continued existence of Slavery in the world, and especially in the United States, a system not merely sinful in itself, but the cause of numerous evils, Political, Social, Commercial and Religious, we rejoice in any favourable symptoms that promise its abolition and utter extinction.

2. Resolved, That, in common with Wilberforce, Buxton, Macaulay, and their associates and successors, we have no confidence in the American Colonisation Society, founded, and chiefly supported, as it has been, by slaveholders—the worst enemies of Freedom and of the Slave, whose welfare they pretend to be anxious to promote by expatriation to Liberia.

3. Resolved, That while we would gratefully record our thanks to those Clergymen and others in the United States, who have so nobly exposed the atrocities of the Fugitive Slave Law—we deplore the indifference of some and the unrighteous approbation of others whose duty it is to vindicate the Gospel of Christ from the aspersions of those who represent it as a shield for cruelty and injustice.

4. Resolved, That as British subjects, and enjoying the blessings of Freedom, we rejoice that Canada is so favourably situated for affording shelter and protection to the poor persecuted American, flying from the grasp of his heartless countrymen.

5. Resolved, That we highly appreciate the self-denying labours of the Members of the "Ladies' Association, for the relief of destitute Coloured Fugitives," and tender them our best thanks for their efficient co-operation in the work of philanthropy and love.

DEFINING POSITIONS.

THE politicians, it seems, have yet to learn that, for a Presidential candidate, the position is the safest which is undefined. If either party could find a man sufficiently known to command some degree of popular enthusiasm, and yet so unknown that people could come to such conclusions as best pleased them in regard to his opinions, his calling and election would be sure beyond a peradventure. Next to such an impossible candidate, the most desirable one is a man who is ignorant of the art and mystery of chirography, and who has attained to that degree of wisdom and firmness as to be able to hold his tongue under every possible provocation. None of the candidates before the public can come under either of these categories, though it was hoped, by some of his friends, that Gen. Scott would answer, in part, to the terms of the last. They are, however, disappointed. He is not content to have it taken for granted that he is as bad as his competitors, but is determined to make it evident under his own hand and seal. The doubt whether he was in favour of Slave-catching, and of any thing else that the Slave-power chose to do, which was to be pleaded on his behalf at the North, is dispelled by one of those convenient men of all work, a Washington correspondent. One of them thus writes to the *Nashville* (Tenn.) *Banner:*

At present, we have but three men spoken of as candidates for the Presidency and for the Vice Presidency, but one of distinguished prominence. The platform of Fillmore, Scott and Webster, is one and the same. They individually plant themselves upon the Compromise measures, maintaining their settlement as an adjustment, in principle and substance, of all the dangerous questions involved. To ascertain definitely the past and the present position of General Scott upon these important measures, I visited him last week, having had the pleasure of a previous acquaintance. In our conversation, I remarked to him that with many Whigs of the South his position was ambiguous, or, indeed, they were not cognizant of it. He observed, that of this he had been informed, and the intelligence, to him, was both painful and surprising. "How can any one doubt my past or present support of them? Did I not, at the first meeting of the friends of the Union, held in Castle Garden, New York, publicly proclaim my approval of them—at a period, too, when but a few in that city advocated the propriety of their adoption? And, immediately after my perusal of Mr. Clay's first great speech in their defence, made in the Senate of the United States, did I not sit down, at my residence in the city of New York, and write to him in substance as follows?

"I have, in my day and generation, fought battles which have gained for our common country some little renown and glory. These, however, might have been won by other men, or, if lost, would have been repaired by the indomitable chivalry of our brave soldiery. But the great battle which you are fighting involves all that is glorious or immortal, of the present and the past, all that is dear and hopeful of the future. It is the battle of the preservation of the Union and the constitution, the perpetuity of our republican institutions. I trust in God that you may be successful in your patriotic undertaking. For I most heartily approve of all the measures of your bill, and will give to them a cordial and energetic support."

This letter, that he addressed to Mr. Clay, he had no copy of, nor of a similar one which he addressed to Mr. Webster, immediately succeeding the perusal of his great speech upon the same measures; but the above is its substance, But this is not all. "Did I not," said he, "during their discussion in Congress, personally exert my influence for their passage through both houses? Besides, there is extant the most incontestible proof that had it not been for my humble aid and influence, the compromise measures could not, by a vote of from five to ten, have passed the House of Representatives." Such is the substance of what he said. The publication of these facts is due to General Scott; for the ignorance of them has abated the ardour of his friends in the South, and aggravated the aspersion of his enemies.

Some other friend of the General's, who, like another famous man, once burnt his mouth with his porridge, has been turning over the report of the great Slave-catching Meeting at Castle Garden, when the unfortunate Union Committee brought their old stock of goods to so bad a market. The General's contribution of principles to those offered for sale on that occasion will, perhaps, turn out an equally bad speculation. The extract from the report is as follows:

There being loud cries for General Scott from all parts of the room, the gallant hero of Lundy's Lane and Mexico, after appropriately acknowledging the compliment, spoke as follows:

The Castle Garden Speech of General Scott, February 25, 1850.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: I came here this evening not expecting to do more than to take my stand in a corner of the room, for the purpose of listening to the proceedings of this very interesting and important meeting. I had no expectation of having the honour to be called upon this stand. I am indebted to the kindness of a friend, who discovered me below, for having the honour to appear in such a conspicuous manner before you. Little did I expect being called upon to address this great and glorious meeting, which is worthy of the Empire City, worthy of the Empire State, and worthy of the Union which you came here to support (great applause). I see before me the intelligence, the wealth, the patriotism of this great city, voluntarily coming here for the purpose of supporting that Union. I am an humble friend and devoted servant of that same Union. I do not call myself a citizen of the East or of the North, of the West or of the South. I have served that Union for nearly forty-two years, and feel that I am a citizen of every part and parcel of this glorious constellation of States. As a friend of the Union, and knowing that the Union is in jeopardy, and knowing that this meeting was called for the purpose of devising measures of compromise and conciliation, I am come here. Many thanks for the kindness you have shown me. I am not an Abolitionist nor an advocate of Slavery. I would not have come here if I had thought these subjects would have militated with each other at this meeting. I did not come here as a Whig or as a Democrat. I have not attended a party meeting for upwards of forty years; but when the cry is that the Union is in danger, and a rally is called for the support of the Union, I would be a coward, and a recreant to my country, if I did not respond to the call. I mean to give my little strength in support of the Union, and, God willing, I will do so. I am not a strong man, but I have a little strength left, and I trust I shall be buried under the Union. God grant that you may devise or fall upon some plan to save that Union to which we are, in heart and soul, all so much devoted.

The gallant General resumed his seat amid the most enthusiastic and prolonged applause. The meeting shortly afterwards adjourned, giving three cheers for General Scott and the Union.

MEMORIAL OF PENNSYLVANIA FRIENDS.

WE are indebted to a friend for a copy of the following Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of Pennsylvania from the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of (Hicksite) Friends, which has not, that we are aware of, been before published. We rejoice in this official protest of Friends against the proposed legislative oppression of the Coloured People of Pennsylvania:

TO THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The Memorial of the Representative Committee or Meeting for Sufferings of the Religious Society of Friends, for the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia, respectfully represents:

That your memorialists have observed, with deep regret, the introduction of a Bill into the Legislature of Pennsylvania, entitled "An Act to Prohibit the Emigration of Negroes and Mulattoes into this Commonwealth," and imposing a penalty upon citizens of this State who shall "employ, or otherwise encourage such negro or mulatto to emigrate into, settle, or remain within the bounds of the Commonwealth."

Your memorialists are known to have been the friends of the class intended to be proscribed by this Act, and have repeatedly appeared in their behalf before the Legislature, to plead their cause, to ask their protection, by just and wise laws, purely upon grounds of philanthropy and justice.

We again appear before you, to ask, in the name of humanity and religion, that no legislative enactment may be permitted to deprive this unfortunate class of the few remaining rights and privileges which they have been permitted to enjoy, and which, in consideration of the manifold blessings we have received at the hands of that Being from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, we ought to protect rather than diminish.

Your memorialists respectfully call your attention to the solemn declarations, made in an hour of great national calamity, when the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in the Act for the gradual Emancipation of Slavery, passed March 1, 1780, solemnly assigned the reasons why they felt bound to restore to this portion of our population the common blessings that they were by nature entitled to, in the following language, to wit: "It is not for us to inquire why, in the creation of mankind, the inhabitants of the several parts of the earth were distinguished by a difference in feature or complexion. It is enough for us to know that all are the work of an Almighty hand. We find, in the distribution of the human species, that the most fertile, as well as the most barren parts of the earth, are inhabited by men of complexions different from ours and from each other; from whence we may reasonably as well as religiously infer, that He who placed them in their various situations, hath extended equally his care and protection to all, and that it becometh not us to counteract his mercies. We esteem it a peculiar blessing granted to us, that we are enabled this day to add one more step to universal civilization, by removing as much as possible the sorrows of those who have lived in undeserved bondage, and from which, by the assumed authority of the King of Great Britain, no effective legal relief could be obtained. Weaned, by a long course of experience, from those narrow prejudices and partialities we had imbibed, we find our heart enlarged with kindness and benevolence towards men of all conditions and nations, and we conceive ourselves at this period extraordinarily called upon, by the blessings we have received, to manifest the sincerity of our professions, and to give a substantial proof of our gratitude."

By this Act of Assembly, Slavery became finally abolished within the limits of this Commonwealth, and subsequent experience has amply shown that the presence of the free coloured population has not been prejudicial to the general welfare and prosperity of the State.

We have not seen any reasons offered for the proposed measure, neither do we believe that there are any considerations of expediency urging it upon us as a matter of safety or necessity; and we believe our own rights become insecure the moment we look with apathy upon an infringement of the rights of others.

The passage of such a law, in a Commonwealth that was founded on those broad principles of philanthropy and justice, which offered a shelter to "men of all conditions and nations," and which has become, under their successful operation, a great and prosperous community, would present the anomaly of a strong and powerful State, forgetting its obligations to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, forsaking the high position it has hitherto taken of its respect for the rights of all mankind, and becoming the oppressor of a down trodden people, who, however humble may be their position in human society, are nevertheless a part of the family of that Great Being, "who hath extended equally his care and protection to all," without respect to nation or colour.

To make it criminal for men to wear the complexion which nature has given them, would be a new and extraordinary feature in the legislation of Pennsylvania, a dark stain upon our statute book, a retrograde step in civilization, an act of injustice, a disgrace to religion, and a dishonour in the Divine sight.

Your memorialists, therefore, respectfully but earnestly remonstrate against the passage of any law that would deprive this class of persons of any rights, in which they have hitherto been protected ever since the founder of this great Commonwealth prepared an asylum, in an American wilderness, and dedicated it to freedom and the rights of man.

Signed, by direction and on behalf of the Meeting aforesaid, by

WILLIAM W. MOORE, Clerk.

Philadelphia, Sec. Mo. 13th, 1852.

☞ THE *Portland Inquirer* and *Anti-Slavery Standard* have promptly and honourably corrected the error into which they had fallen, in crediting that most loathsome article, headed "Northern Negroes," to the *Eastern Argus.*

Will not the *Argus* state that the error was not ours? Our editorial conscience is tender on the subject of credits, and we are not willing that a sin of omission or commission of that sort should be attributed to us when we do not deserve it.

HON. WM. H. SEWARD of the U. S. Senate, will accept our thanks for a copy of his eloquent Speech before that body, on the proposed Protest of the United States against the armed intervention of Russia, in the Hungarian Revolution.

REPLY TO DR. PEABODY.*

BY WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH....NO. I.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY.

"We men of Massachusetts, of this age, have a question, the accomplishment of which, for better or worse, will stand long after moth and rust shall have corrupted all the factories and their fabrics, and the thief Time shall have pilfered all this generation's heaps of gold."—*John Gorham Palfrey.*

"Do you say that the people of the free States have nothing to do with it, and can do nothing? Would to God this were true! But it is not true. The people of the free States have defended, encouraged and participated; and are more guilty for it, before God, than the South, in that they have *not* the apology of education or custom."—*Harriet Beecher Stowe.*

IN 1790, there were only 697,897 slaves in all the States; now there are 3,184,262; and in 1880, we shall have more than 6,000,000! The wise and humane among our fathers thought that the day of emancipation was near at hand. To us, it seems more distant than it did to them. Every succeeding day adds 256 to the number of the victims. Every day's delay only serves to increase the number, and render more and more difficult the struggle which must ensue before the evil can remedied. Where is there, then, among all the questions which we consider of the most vital consequence to the advancement of the race, or to our happiness and well-being as a nation—where is there one which even approximates in importance this—How soon, and in what manner, shall we put an end to chattel Slavery? Other questions there are of the very greatest moment, but this overshadows them all

Before, however, we can really work in behalf of freedom, we must feel some responsibility for the existence of Slavery, some duty to labour for its removal. The Rev. Dr. Ephraim Peabody, in his recent article in the *North American Review*, practically denies that we have any such responsibility; and, though the topic is somewhat threadbare, we must consider it.

It is conceded on all hands, that the right to legislate in regard to Slavery belongs exclusively to the individual States in which that institution exists. Each State has the right to abolish Slavery within its own borders, and no other State is permitted to interfere with its action. The General Government may, at most, admit it into, or exclude it from, the Territories of the Union, though, even in regard to the right of exercising this power, there is not universal agreement. But its authority certainly ceases when the Territories become States. This single consideration, without reference to any thing else, shows that the direct power, both of the General Government and of the Free States, over Slavery, is confined within very narrow limits. Instead of the several States deriving from the Union authority to interfere with one another's domestic institutions, the organic law by which they are united excludes them from such interference, and at the same time relieves them from a corresponding responsibility.

There is, however, a limitation of our power over Slavery far more insuperable than any imposed by arbitrary laws or treaties, growing out of the manner in which it is wrought into the general framework of our institutions. Putting aside all questions which relate to the origin and character of Slavery, and viewing it simply under its present aspects, the prominent fact which strikes one is, that it implies a certain condition of society—a stage of civilization, in which all—white as well as blacks—are implicated.—*Slavery in the U. States*, p. 4.

Most of us are glad to be convinced that we have no responsibility, and, accordingly, no duty to perform in relation to Slavery. Such a conclusion tallies well with our material interests. We are all glad to be able to sell our silks and keep our principles; but it requires moral heroism to enable us to keep our principles at the expense of our trade. We think it, therefore, peculiarly unfortunate that Dr. P. begins his article by thus practically denying all responsibility on our part for the existence of Slavery. In his opinion, as States, we have no power at all over Slavery; and, as parts of the General Government, we have only a voice in relation to admitting or excluding Slavery from the national Territories, though he considers it doubtful whether we have even this power. In other words, as States, we clearly have no responsibility whatever; and, as part of the General Government, it is very doubtful whether we have any more!

As the people of Massachusetts are responsible for the existence of the wrong sanctioned by our State constitution because we ourselves have framed it, so we must share in the responsibility for the existence of the wrong sanctioned by the national constitution, because the people of this State have aided in framing it, and have *agreed* to support it. The United States Constitution and laws are the supreme law of Massachusetts, *solely* because the people of Massachusetts have agreed that they shall be. So far, then, as Slavery in the Southern States is supported by the national constitution and laws, so far we, the people of Massachusetts, have solemnly pledged ourselves to support it; so far we are responsible for the existence of the evil, and so far we are bound to labour for its removal.

Although Dr. P. alludes, as we have seen, to one of the powers of the General Government, he does not make even the faintest allusion to the other very material supports which our national constitution exercises over Slavery in the States. Indeed, from reading his article, no one would ever dream that this instrument contained *any* special provisions in relation to Slavery. He cannot shelter himself from censure by saying that he *intentionally* avoided all reference to the bearings of Slavery on the politics of the day, because he does refer to the very one of all the powers of the General Government which has *most* connection with the politics of the day: for what has mingled itself more with politics, for the last three or four years, than the question of the Wilmot Proviso?

To what extent, then, is Slavery recognised as a national institution—to what extent have the people of Massachusetts, by adopting the constitution, pledged themselves to support Slavery, for to this extent they are just as much and as clearly responsible as if this support was given by our State constitution and State laws? By Art. 1, sec. 2, Con. U. S., we give to the free persons in the Slave States, *solely* because they are slaveholders, a larger representation, and consequently greater political power, than the same number of free persons in the Free States. In other words, we created, for the first time in the annals of the world, and for the last sixty years have fostered, a "slave power." We give to the free population in the Slave States, in addition to all that rightfully belongs to them, the same amount of political power that we give to 19,10,556 freemen at the North. In other words, we not only give the Slave States the same political power that we give to Northern States having the same free population, but, in addition to all this, and solely because they are slaveholders, we give them greater political power than is given to Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island united! Between 1790–1800, there were 13; between 1800–1810, 16; between 1810–1820, 20; between 1820–1830, 23; between 1830–1840, 25; and between 1840–1850, 21 representatives on the floor of Congress, representing, with our consent, this slave power. Who can calculate the disastrous influence of this representation in gradually weakening public sentiment against Slavery? Sixty years ago, William Pinkney declared that if Slavery should survive fifty years, it would work a "decay of the spirit of liberty in the Free States;" and John Quincy Adams, the old man eloquent, with an experience covering the whole period of the existence of the Government, declared that the prophecy has been fulfilled, and that the effect of this clause has been to make "the preservation, propagation and perpetuation of Slavery the vital and animating spirit of the national Government."* Have the people of Massachusetts no responsibility to bear, no duty to perform, for thus aiding to strengthen the slave interest?

The laws of one State, whether they support Slavery or any other institution, have no power in another State. Consequently, if a slave escapes into a free State, he becomes free. This is the general rule of law; this was the law of Massachusetts prior to the adoption of the United States Constitution. In virtue of this rule, thousands of slaves are now free on the soil of Canada. But by Art. 4, sec. 2, Con. U. S., we repeal this general rule of law in order to support Slavery, and declare that if any slaves shall escape to Massachusetts, they shall *not* thereby become free, but that we will deliver them up to their masters! In other words, *we have repealed our own laws in favour of freedom, and created others to favour Slavery!* By *our* supreme law, William and Ellen Craft were still slaves on the soil of Massachusetts! Have we, then, no duty to perform in relation to freeing ourselves from this base and degrading duty of slave-catching? How can we be free from all responsibility for Slavery so long as we capture and return, at our expense, runaway slaves? Who *is* responsible for sending back Thomas Sims, if we are not?

Slave-owners are not the only slave*holders*. All persons who voluntarily assist, or pledge themselves to assist, in holding persons in Slavery, are slaveholders. But by Art. 1, Sec. 8; Art. 4, Sec. 4, Con. U. S. we have pledged our whole national strength to the slave-owners to aid them, if necessary, in holding their slaves in subjection. Massachusetts said to Frederick Douglass, the slave in Maryland, if you claim by force of arms the position which we admit that nature, and nature's God have assigned you, we will do our best to crush you. Have we then no duty to perform in relation to freeing ourselves from this base compact by which freemen agree to aid in holding slaves? Did not our gratuitous troops march to aid in suppressing Nat Turner's insurrection? If those who directed and paid those troops are not responsible, who is?

We have *exclusive* jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. By our laws 3,687 human beings are there held in Slavery! Our dungeon holds in confinement those heroic men, Drayton and Sayres, who were convicted of no higher crime than that they sympathized with human suffering, and did for black men what we eulogise others for doing in behalf of whites. Nay, so base are we, that we permit the city of Washington to derive an income from the *trade* in men and women! Any wretch, who is willing to pay four hundred dollars a year into the city Treasury, may, with *our* permission, "trade or traffic in slaves for profit, whether an agent or otherwise." If our debtors cannot pay their debts, we seize and sell to the highest bidder, women and children, and carry the proceeds into the National Treasury, and if *free* coloured men cannot prove their freedom, they are sold at auction as slaves for life to pay their jail fees! The people of Massachusetts must share in the infamy and responsibility of these acts—for our agents do them, our laws support them.

In 1820, semi-barbarous Mexico decreed the unconditional emancipation of her slaves. In 1850 we expressly authorized the introduction of Slavery into the territory of Utah! We refused to prohibit its introduction into New Mexico, but did give up to Texas and *certain* Slavery about 70,000 square miles of territory—a territory larger than all New England! Mr. P. asserts that the whole of the immense territory extorted from Mexico, so far as its condition had not been determined by previous legislation, appears practically to have ranged itself on the side of freedom (p. 34).

The "previous legislation" of Mexico we have either repealed or refused to sanction. Every mail from California brings us evidence that they are on the point of dividing that State in order to admit Slavery. Even under the present constitution, they have almost succeeded in establishing a virtual system of servitude. There is a law now before the legislature, and which has passed the Assembly by a vote of 42 to 11, which provides that those slaves who were brought into California by their masters, before its admission as a State, and who are consequently now free, shall nevertheless, if they refuse to return home again to Slavery, be deemed fugitive slaves, and be legally compelled to return! Southern newspapers testify to the actual existence of Slavery in all of the Territory extorted from Mexico. They give us the very name of slaveholders, and the number of their slaves now on the way to California. Mr. Peachy, a member of the California Assembly, has just laid before that body a petition from twelve hundred and eighteen citizens of South Carolina and Florida, asking permission "to colonise a rural district with a population of not less than two thousand slaves"! and so far from disposing of it on the spot as asking the passage of a law plainly unconstitutional, it was, after considerable debate, referred to the Committee on Federal relations. The *Frontier Guardian*, a Mormon paper, admits that "there are several men in the valley of the Salt Lake, from the Southern States, who have their slaves with them." In view of these and many similar facts, there is hardly any decent pretence for Mr. P.'s assurance that these Territories will remain free. On the contrary, everything tends to show that Slavery is to be extended to the Pacific; and when this takes place, it will be, either because of our express authority to extend it, or our refusal to prohibit its extension. In either case, the responsibility must rest with the North, for we had the power and refused to exercise it.*

The Constitution U. S., Art. 1, Sec. 8, provides that "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States." Under this power alone, we have the right to abolish the African Slave Trade. And if we can then abolish the Foreign Slave Trade, under the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, we may also abolish the Domestic Slave Trade, under the power to regulate commerce among the several States. Have we then no solemn duty to perform, if we not only refuse to prohibit the over land trade in slaves, but actually legalize the coastwise slave trade? Not a single slave ship can clear or enter our ports, without first receiving a permit to carry or bring in slaves, signed by our Collector. Nay, so zealous have we been to protect this traffic, that we have even gone so far as to hint at war with England unless she gave indemnity for slaves who were driven into ports in the West Indies, or who went in voluntarily, having redeemed themselves by their own manly arms.

Not only is Dr. P. thus fatally mistaken is supposing that the Constitution deprives us of all power to act on the subject of Slavery, and thereby relieves us of all responsibility in the matter, but, as we shall hereafter see, he relies for the success of his darling scheme—Colonisation—in a great degree upon the aid of the General and State governments. But we cannot give this aid, unless we have the constitutional power to do so; and if we have such power, not even Dr. P. can help admitting that we are responsible if we fail to exercise it.

But he thinks there is "a limitation of our power over Slavery far more invincible than any imposed by arbitrary laws or treaties growing out of the manner in which it is wrought into the general framework of our institutions." The existence of Slavery "implies a certain condition of Society—a stage of civilization, in which all, whites as well as blacks, are implicated."

This argument applies equally to all social evils, intemperance, war, licentiousness, poverty. According to Dr. P., we are less responsible for the existence of these evils, when they are wrought into the framework of our institutions, than we should be if our fundamental constitution deprived us of all power over them. This also is a very comforting doctrine! If we could only bring our hearts to practice on it, from how much outside pressure our pockets would be relieved! The poor may ask our aid, and we may answer them, we are not responsible for your being poor—help yourself! The poor victim whom want drives to licenticusness, may appeal to us for aid—why should we trouble ourselves? Are not these evils ingrained into the very framework of society, and we did not make society! They are organic sins. They imply *only* a certain stage of civilization, and by no means any responsibility on our part for earnest labour for their removal?

Such arguments are unworthy a heart of flesh. Wherever our brothers are afflicted with evil, no matter whether that evil lies at the very foundation stone of our social organization, we are bound as men to labour for its removal. And if we fail to use all our opportunities, and all our abilities to this end, we fail in the performance of a plain duty. If we, single-handed, cannot reform the state, we can at least give a brave heart to the work, and we are recreant to the trust committed to us if we fail so to do. If Massachusetts cannot reform the Union, it can, at least, wash its hands of the sin of slaveholding and slavecatching, and if it fails to do so, it also is faithless to its own admitted duty; for the end of government "is to furnish the individuals who compose the body politic with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights," "among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties." (Preamble to Con. Mass.) A state of society which does not recognise it as a duty on the part of its citizens to labour to remove social evils, has no right or claim to be called citizens.

In what has preceded, we have proved our responsibility in the matter of Slavery, by showing the terms of our political union with the South. We might draw

* Mr Richard Morris, of Hanover, in the Virginia Conv

the same inference from our commercial, our social, and our religious union, but already more than enough has been written to demonstrate that the idea with which Dr. P.'s article starts, has no foundation whatever in fact. As individuals and as States, we are under very heavy responsibilities, and our duty to labour for freedom is proportionally urgent.

Domestic Correspondence.

From a New Hampshire Correspondent.

BRADFORD, N. H., March 22, 1852.

MR. GAY—*Dear Sir:* The annual election in this State of the 9th instant is past, and, as the smoke of the battle is over, we now know something as to what has been done. As the political barometer, when Freedom and Slavery are to some extent in question, indicates the state or progress of Anti-Slavery sentiment and feeling, I will give you, in my way, briefly, some of the results of the late election. The Old Hunker Democrats, by means of party training and discipline, and taking advantage of the liquor question and of various other corrupt and deceptive operations, have succeeded in electing Noah Martin, their candidate for Governor, by a majority of about twelve hundred, in a vote of near sixty thousand. The demagogues of the party could be "as Anti-Slavery as anybody" when they supposed they could thereby get votes, and even express an abhorrence of the Fugitive Slave Law, as was done at a public meeting, a short time before the election, in New Boston—the place of residence of John Atwood, the candidate of the Independent Democrats, for Governor. The Old Hunkers got the votes of those in the liquor interest. Pro Slavery and pro-rum hereabouts morally go together. They also got the mass of the driftwood voters, who care no more about Slavery nor Anti-Slavery than Gallio did about the uproar at Ephesus. Their opponents at the ballot-box were all real or quasi Anti-Slavery men—and indeed, on the single question of Freedom or Slavery, unmixed with other matters, I am inclined to think the mass of the people of this State of all parties would go for Freedom and Human Rights. But it seems to be a fact, and passing strange, too, that among many people these days, a mere party name is more potent than anything else.

The Hunkers made this town one of the principal battle grounds in the late campaign, using their utmost efforts to prevent the election of an anti-Hunker representative to the Legislature, but in this they were defeated. MOSES E. BAXTER, a friend of John P. Hale, was triumphantly elected representative.

As I have not much of interest to you to write from among the mountains here, I will not at present take more of your time in reading my scrawls.

Yours truly, W. T.

LETTER FROM PARKER PILLSBURY.

DEAR FRIEND GAY: I am still in Connecticut, though perhaps to little purpose. It is a most barren and sterile spot. If we could only induce it to emigrate West, something might be made of it. Northern Ohio was settled almost wholly from this State, and is one of the most free and liberal districts in the Country. The people are wonderfully improved by a change of place. Even when the Connecticut folks go there only for a visit, it improves them for the time being, greatly.

Scarcely any Anti-Slavery papers are taken here. But there is more reading of trash, the vilest kind of trash, like the *Boston Olive Branch*, Bennett's *Herald*, and the yellow covered Novels that swarm like Egyptian Locusts, a terrible omnipresence, than in any place I have ever seen

Not having seen the *Standard* for so long, I did not know until yesterday, whether, you were publishing my sketches on the use of tobacco. Since you do count them worthy a corner of the paper, I will give you a half column more, and that will do for the present

In one town, I was, for a day, most reluctantly kept at a miserable Hotel. About noon, a wedding party, consisting of ten or twenty couples, all in open carriages, one couple in each, called, as I supposed, for dinner. The ladies were waited upon into the parlour, and treated to lemonade. Then all the gentlemen went to the bar and called for brandy. They soon drained the bar dry, and a boy was sent to a grocery opposite, with a quart jug, to replenish.

After drinking themselves rich and merry, they ordered their horses. Then each and every one of them lighted a long but very bad smelling cigar, and, loading in his lady, drove off.

It was a sight and scene not often witnessed. I could but ask, why should not the ladies be treated to two glasses of brandy each, and a long cigar? They had both, and enough of them, however, at second hand. The breath of such creatures must have been a trial of strength to the stomach of an alligator. Down the street they all went, one after the other, every man of them puffing out his smoke, like a steam engine, the wind whiffing it into the broad bonnets of the ladies, as if they were actually designed for bacon. Had they insisted on smoking too, they probably would all have been left at the tavern. Even their filthy beaux would have been ashamed of their company with cigars in their mouths.

But I warrant you some of them will soon inbibe the habit, and show themselves, at least in this one accomplishment, fully equal to their liege lords.

I saw an instance to be recorded. At one place, we had, among much other company, two women, a mother and her daughter; the one not too old, the other not too young, to be nursing an infant.

One day after dinner, these two women moved directly to the front of the fire, and, pulling their well used pipes from their pockets, filled them brim full of the strongest of tobacco, and prepared for a regular regale. And it was a regale.

As soon as they were lighted up to the highest possible heat (and they evidently did nothing at halves), they both took their babes, and instantly all four profoundly engaged in the same occupation, sucking away, as if for dear life. Each mother placed her left elbow on the corresponding knee, resting her child's head in the bend of her arms, while with the upturned hand, she held her pipe steady, and removed it at brief periods, for expectorating purposes. The right hand was reserved for miscellaneous uses, particularly the forefinger for crowding down the fire in the pipe—a most needful caution, as it seemed every moment ready to fall in a storm, directly in the face of the child.

And there those mothers sat, poisoning themselves, and sending the fatal virus (in that which should have been a delicate and pure aliment), in streams of death, all through the systems of their helpless offspring. I sickened in soul and body at the sight, and hastened into the fresh air out of doors; not, however, until my mind was known on so shocking a transaction.

There sat those mothers, committing deliberate suicide on themselves, and cold-blooded murder on their children. It was a scene not to be described. I have seen one mother, many is the time, thus murderously engaged; but the butchery, in this most revolting way, of two babies at once, was more than I had prepared for, bad as the world is becoming.

Yours as ever, PARKER PILLSBURY.

Hartford Ct., March 20th 1852.

——TEMPERANCE ARGUMENTS.—The editor of *The Journal of Commerce* has seen a three dollar bill bearing the following indorsement:

"This is the last left me from a fortune of eight thousand dollars, bequeathed me by a beloved uncle. Oh Rum! thou art the cause of all this. Beware, young men, of the wine-glass; it has been the ruin of me. Oh Rum! sure at last thou 'bitest like an adder.'

NEW YORK, Sept., 1851."

——HORACE MANN thus sums up a few of the advantages of modern inventions: "One boy, with a foudrinier machine, will make more paper in a twelve-month than all Egypt could have made in a hundred years during the reign of the Ptolemies. One girl with a power-press, will strike off books faster than a million scribes could copy them before the invention of printing. One man with an iron foundry will turn out more utensils than Tubal Cain could have forged had he worked diligently to this time."

——KOSSUTH.—No preparations were made to receive M. Kossuth at Memphis, Tenn., and he therefore did not stop there.

XXXIId CONGRESS.....First Session.

WE select, as usual, from the Congressional proceedings of the week, such as seem to us of sufficient importance to warrant their republication in a weekly Anti-Slavery journal. On Monday, both Houses turned from the discussion of the available qualities of Presidential candidates to subjects of more abiding interest, as will be seen below:

SENATE.....WASHINGTON, March 16.

FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

Mr. Seward presented a petition in favour of the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, which he moved be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Mason said he would not object.

Mr, Norris (N. H.) moved to lay Mr. Seward's petition on the table. Carried by a vote of 33 to 11, as follows:

YEAS—Adams, Atchinson, Badger, Bayard, Borland, Bradbury, Brodhead, Brooke, Cass, Clarke, Clemens, Cooper, Dawson, Dodge (Iowa), Douglass, Downs, Felch, Geyer, Gwin, Hunter, Jones (Iowa), Jones (Tenn.), King, Mallory, Mangum, Mason, Miller, Norris, Rusk, Sebastian, Sprunance, Underwood, Walker—33.

NAYS—Chase, Davis, Dodge (Wis.), Fish, Foote, Hale, Hamlin, Seward, Sumner, Upham, Wade—11.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

Mr. Seward presented a petition, asking that Congress would take measures for the extinction of Slavery.

Mr. Dawson asked if the Senator from New York believed Congress had any such power?

Mr. Seward said he presented the petition as he did all other petitions, because he believed the petitioners had a right to petition.

Mr. Norris moved to lay it on the table. Carried—Yeas 36, Nays 6.

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Atchinson, Badger, Bayard, Borland, Bradbury, Brodhead, Brooke, Cass, Clarke, Clemens, Dawson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Fish, Geyer, Gwin, Hamlin, Hunter, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tenn., King, Mallory, Mangum, Mason, Miller, Norris, Rhett, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Sprunance, Underwood, Walker—36

NAYS—Messrs. Dodge of Wisconsin, Foote, Hale, Seward, Sumner, Wade—6.

FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

Mr Hale presented a petition praying for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law. Among other reasons, he said, which was given for the repeal of the law, by the petitioners, was, that it held out to the Judge a bribe. It gave a fee double, in case of conviction, to what was given in case of acquittal.

Mr. Mangum—How much is that?

Mr. Hale—The Judge gets five dollars if he acquits, and ten if he sends the party into Slavery. He moved it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Mangum said that he felt interested and concerned in the character of the Judiciary of the whole country. He had high respect for Judges of all sections; he could not permit such an imputation upon the integrity of the Judges of any section to pass unrebuked. The petition contained a libel, a foul slander and atrocious calumny upon the Judges and the whole Judiciary of that part of the country where this law was to operate. It should be treated as it deserved He moved it be laid on the table

Mr. Hale said that, some two years ago, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Butler), now absent, and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Mason), had declared they would not again object to the reception of those petitions which he occasionally presented. He was surprised that they were objected to now.

Mr. Mason said he did not remember that he had said what the Senator (Mr. Hale) now stated, but, knowing what his sentiments then and now were, it was likely he had said so. He would not now object to this petition; but if the Senate called upon him to vote, he would vote against it. By saying that he would not interpose objections, he did not wish to be understood as being in favour of any further agitation of the subject.

Mr. Mangum's motion was then agreed to.

THE AMISTAD CASE.

Mr. Mason, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported a bill to indemnify the master and owners of the Spanish schooner Amistad. He moved it be made the special order for the 6th of April,

Mr. Underwood moved a longer period.

Mr. Mason moved that his bill be postponed to, and made the special order for Monday the 26th April.

Mr. Hale asked for a division on the question, which being done, the bill was postponed till the 26th April.

On the question being put of making it a special order for that day, the vote was Ayes 19, Noes 19, lost.

Mr. Mason asked if the bill would now go on the calendar.

The Chair said, not till the 26th April.

Mr. Mason moved that the vote postponing the bill be reconsidered, which was carried, and then the motion to postpone was withdrawn. So the bill takes its regular place on the calendar

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.....March 29.

NAVY DISCIPLINE BILL.

Mr Stanton (Tenn., Loco) said he was ready to report from the Committee on Naval Affairs the Senate bill enforcing discipline and good morals in the Navy The East India squadron is about to sail, and it is deemed important by the commanding officers that the bill should be passed.

Mr. Venable (N. C., Loco) briefly urged the taking up of the bill.

Mr. Brown's resolution was not received, however, the House refusing to suspend the rules.

Mr. Stanton (Tenn., Loco) then asked leave to introduce the Navy Discipline bill.

Mr. Fowler (Mass., Whig) said it had been stated in the papers that the expedition spoken of is to enter into negotiations with the Japanese at all hazards. Is this so?

Mr. Stanton—I am not able to inform the gentleman.

Mr. Stanly (N. C., Whig) I call the gentleman from Massachusetts to order. The inquiry has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. Fowler—I will put another.

Mr. Stanly—I object and call to order.

Mr. Stanton, by general consent, said if the bill should not now be passed, it is not likely the East India squadron, which is about to sail, will receive information of its passage for twelve months to come; during which time there will, without this bill, be no effectual means of enforcing discipline in the service

The rules were suspended, and Mr. Stanton reported the bill which was read.

It proposes, in place of the lash, to punish sailors for offenses by diminishing the rations, restricting them to diet of bread and water, and imposing extra police.

In cases of theft, in addition to the foregoing, to wear badge, with the word "Thief" on it, and to make good the amount stolen. Solitary confinement, wearing ball and chain, deprivation of liberty on shore, &c.

As inducements to good behaviour, a system of rewards is likewise incorporated therein.

The Committee propose to strike out the punishment of wearing the thief badge

Mr. Stanton further explained the bill, and said in conclusion that the Secretary of the Navy and the commanders of the squadrons about to sail are anxious for the passage of the bill.

Mr. Jones (Tenn., Loco) said there was too much in the bill to pass in this hurried way.

Mr. Stuart (Mich., Loco) remarked that there are several things in the bill he could not vote for, and he suggested that the bill be printed, and that Thursday be set apart for its consideration. His present imperfect understanding of the bill—should he be pressed to vote—would compel him to vote against it.

Mr. Stanton had no objection to postpone the bill to an early day. He had thought, however, that the provisions are so simple as clearly and easily to be understood.

Mr. Stuart moved to make the bill the special order for Thursday next, and proceeded to give his reasons for the motion. He had voted to abolish flogging in the Navy, and enumerated his objections to this bill at considerable length.

Mr. Stanly replied. It was obvious that the gentleman would vote against the bill in any form As all members could not examine into every measure brought forward, in was evident they must take some things on faith. The Naval Committees of the Senate and House have approved of this bill, and it has the sanction of the commanders, who have spent nearly all their lives on salt water, in the service of their country.

Mr. Bayley (Va., Loco) having been requested, by a number of gentlemen interested in the Naval service, to examine the bill, he had done so, and was satisfied, not only of the propriety of passing it, but of the necessity of passing it at once. He said the difficulties on shipboard usually occur two or three weeks after the vessels go out of port. On plantations the negroes during the first two or three weeks, try the temper of a new overseer; so with the sailors; they try the temper of the commander, and see what he can do. If you give them an inch they will take an ell. To have a good voyage out, is to have discipline maintained during the first two or three weeks.

Mr. Orr (S. C. Loco) asked Mr. Bayly whether it was right to force a passage on the bill when other gentlemen had not an opportunity of examining it.

Mr. Bayly replied—If this bill was complicated in its character there might be some force in the objections of the gentleman. He undertook to say that nineteen-twentieths of the bills reported here are voted on without having been read by the members; and if this bill shall be passed without having been read by one-tenth, it would by no means be singular in that respect. He moved the previous question, having obtained the floor on that condition from Mr. Stanly.

Mr. Jones (Tenn., Loco) asked, but without success, that the motion be withdrawn, therefore he expressed the hope that it would be voted down. We did not, said he, contract for pensions and asylums for sailors when we voted that the bill be reported.

Mr. Stuart moved to postpone the further consideration of the bill until Thursday. The demand for the previous question was first voted on and seconded. Ayes, 81; Nays, 69. This cut off the motion to postpone.

Mr. Orr moved that the bill be laid on the table. Negatived. Yeas, 84; Nays, 94.

The amendment to strike out the clause requiring a guilty sailor to wear a badge with the word "thief" on it, was agreed to. The bill was then rejected. Yeas, 76; Nays, 97—as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Abercrombie, Aiken, Appleton, Mass; Ashe, Bayly, Va.; Bartlett, Bennett, Bocock, Bowie, Bragg, Breckenridge, Brown, Miss; Brown, N. J.; Burrows, Cabell, Chandler, Clingman, Cottman, Davis, Dean, Dockery, Evans, Florence, Freeman, Fuller, Pa.; Fuller, Me.; Gentry, Goodenow, Goodrich, Grey, Hammond, Harper, Haines, Ala; Hart, Haven, Hillyer, Horsford, Thos. M. Howe, Jackson, Johnson, Ga.; Johnson, Ark.; King, R. I.; Kuhns, Landry, Martin, McDonald, Meacham, Meade, Miller, Miner, Moore, Pa.; Moorhead, Penn.; Porter, Riddle, Sacket, Schoolcraft, Scudder, Scurry, Smart, Snow, Stanly, Stanton, Tenn.; Stanton, Ky.; Stevens, N. Y.; Sutherland, Taylor, Thompson, Miss.; Venerable, Walbridge, Walsh, Ward, Washburn, Welch, Wells, White, Ala., and Williams—76

NAYS—Messrs Allen, Ill.; Allison, Averett, Barrere Beale, Bessell, Brenton, Briggs, Buell, Busby, Cable, Ohio; Campbell, Ohio; Campbell, Ill.; Caskie, Chapman, Conn.; Churchwell, Clark, Cleveland, Cobb, Curtis, Daniel, Davis, Ind.; Dawson, Dimmick, Doty, Dunham, Durkee, Eastman, Edgerton, Edmunson, Ficklin, Fitch, Floyd, Fowler, Gamble, Gaylord, Gorman, Grow, Harris, Tenn.; Hendricks, Hene, Hibbard, Holladay, Houston, Ala.; Howard, John W. Howe, Huster, Ingersoll, Ives, Jenkins, Johnson, Tennessee; Johnson, Ohio; Jones, Tenn.; Jones, Pa.; Preston, King, Letcher, Lockhart, Mace, Mann, Marshall, Ky.; Mason, McLanahan, McMullen, McQueen, Millson, Molony, Moore, La.; Murray, Nabers, Newton, Olds, Orr, Parker, Ind.; Peaslee, Penniman, Perkins, Polk, Powell, Robbins, Robinson, Ross, Savage, Seymour, N. Y.; Smith, Stanton, Ohio; Stevens, Pa.; Martin, Stuart, Sweetzer, Thompson, Va.; Tuck, Wallace, Watkins, White, Ky.; Wilcox, Woodward—97.

Mr. Millson (Va., Loco) moved a reconsideration of the vote—one of the reasons for doing which was that, for nearly fifty years no commander or officer in the Navy, even of the higest grade, was authorized to inflict of his own individual authority, more than twelve lashes for any offence. The law provided that if offences were deemed to deserve severer punishment, a Court Martial should be convened by the Secretary of the Navy, if the offence was committed within the limits of the United States, or the Commander of a squadron, if without the United States' jurisdiction. This was a regulation to guard the rights of the youngest seamen; yet this bill, which has just been rejected, proposed to confer on any officer, it commanding but a schooner, the power to consign the sailor to solitary confinement for 30 days, with irons on his arms and ankles—with diet of bread and water; and this without requiring a record of the crime and punishment to be kept by anybody. He would not consent to confer this power on any man. However, it was exceedingly important to have laws for the punishment of crimes on shipboard, and hence his motion to reconsider, that proper amendments may be made to the bill

Mr. Evans (Md., Whig) spoke in favor of the bill and expressed himself opposed to this modern and sickly sentimentality exhibited even in the Halls of Congress. He had voted to abolish flogging, and if he could restore it he would. American sailors do not compose a tithe of the crews; they are composed, for the most part of foreigners, jail-birds—who have been in the slave trade and committed piracy—men who require the strong hand of power to be held over them. These men go on board to eat Uncle Sam's beef and bread and drink his whisky. In conclusion, he would recommend to the sympathizers with such characters, that they passed a bill giving the crews the power to elect their commanders and to elect their Juries by ballot.

Mr. Stanly suggested an amendment that punishment be inflicted according to the resolution of '98 and '99, [laughter] and that the selection be *viva voce* instead of by ballot. [Laughter.]

Mr. Stanton (Tenn) said that the bill proposed a system of rewards; especially that after twenty years of service, the sailor shall be permitted to go into the Naval Asylum, with half-pay during his life.

Mr. Hall, (Mo., Loco) asked whether the gentleman would be willing to pension officers of the Army and Navy, who have served faithfully for twenty years.

Mr. Stanton replied, that the Committee on Naval Affairs will report a bill putting disabled Naval officers on a retired list, thus opening a way to the promotion of young officers. For himself, he would not be willing to turn them or the sailors away, after having faithfully served their country.

Mr Orr opposed hasty legislation on the bill, and wanted time to examine.

Mr. Venable justified the vote which he gave for the bill, and spoke of the difficulty in which the majority had placed themselves.

Mr. Millson said he had conversed with a large number of those who had voted against the bill, and had learned that they would prefer having no bill at all, to this one.

Mr. Jones (Tenn.) proposed to relieve the majority from the dilemma in which the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Venable) seemed to think they had involved themselves, by moving to lay the proposition to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected on the table, and expressed the hope that the House would not adjourn until the question should be taken. We will now see who will face the music.

However, the House adjourned, and the subject went over.

Miscellaneous News.

LETTER OF LEWIS TAPPAN.

WE have a very short reply to make to the letter of MR. LEWIS TAPPAN, which may be found in another column. He affects to make a broad distinction between a withdrawal and a secession from the American Anti-Slavery Society, being remarkably ingenuous and clear-sighted; and repels, as a calumny, the charge that they who seceded—we mean who withdrew—from that Society in 1840, did so in any spirit of hostility! Why they withdrew, if they were in a fraternal state of mind, he does not say. His demand for facts to prove their hostility, and that they were and are actuated by a hostile spirit, is, at this late day, sublime effrontery, such as it would be extremely difficult for any other person to match. When he declares, 'The majority of the men who withdrew, did it in a peaceful, not a hostile manner': that 'neither they, nor their adherents or successors, have ever made any attempt to destroy or injure your Society'; that 'the old committee did not seize the *Emancipator*'; that 'they never attempted to crush the *Liberator*' &c &c, we have only to say, that we cannot regard him as a truthful man, and regret the extremely bad condition of his conscience. This he will call personal; it is so, but we cannot help it. As to renewing in our columns a controversy, which occupied several years, respecting the spirit, purpose and tendency of 'New Organization,' but which has long since ceased to be of general interest, he greatly presumes upon our simplicity if he supposes we shall gratify him. The files of the *Liberator* and *Standard*, from 1840 to 1845, can be consulted, if he or any one else need light on the subject; but he needs none, nor any in the Anti-Slavery ranks.

The establishment of the *National Era*, at Washington, is claimed by Mr. Tappan as among the many Anti-Slavery works of the Society of which he is almost 'the sum and substance,' notwithstanding his modest disclaimer. Now, this hearty approval of the *Era* shows the milk-and-water quality of his abolitionism; for that journal is so politic, adroit, and careful not to give offence, in its management of the abolition question, that it has no more claim to be considered Anti-Slavery than scores of other journals which make no special pretensions on that score. That the *Era* has seventeen thousand subscribers is demonstrative evidence that it is not a radical sheet. If it were, in spite of its undeniable ability, its subscription list would be a very lean one; if it were, it could not be published three weeks consecutively in the city of Washington.

As for the relative power and directness of the two Societies—the American A. S. Society and the American *and Foreign* A. S. Society—we submit one fact to illustrate the difference between them, and deem it idle to add another word: Not a hall can be obtained in the city of New York, in which to hold the annual meeting of the Old Society, so malignant is the pro-slavery and mobocratic spirit against it: The new Society can readily obtain the Tabernacle, and many other buildings, and neither a pro-slavery priesthood, on the one hand, nor Capt. Rynders and his demonical associates, on the other, care a straw about any of its proceedings!

As for our 'roundly asserting,' that the Delegation (composed of himself and others, who waited upon Kossuth,) 'in signing the Letter, expressly added, *For the Committee* of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,' and which assertion Mr. Tappan 'roundly' declares to be untrue, our defence is, that, as the Letter aforesaid appeared at the time in the New York papers, the words, '*For the Committee*,' &c. were appended to the signatures, and have not been pronounced a forgery till now. Who committed that forgery? and what is the exact truth in the case.—*Liberator.*

MR. GARRISON AND HIS CAUSE.

No one, Mr. Editor, who feels that he has a claim to be heard in your columns, can, I believe, justly complain of your excluding him from a hearing. Whether equal fairness and magnanimity are always evinced in your replies to inquiries, or your censures of opponents, is another matter. Relying, however, upon your disposition to allow correspondents to appeal to your readers, I proceed to say, that your reply to my late communication is faulty in several respects. First, as to the Letter to Kossuth. You intimate that it was a 'quibble,' on my part, when it was said the Letter was not the act of the Executive Committee, but of the Delegation; and roundly assert that, 'in signing the Letter, they expressly add, "*For the Committee* of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society."' I alluded to the circumstance, not as a matter of much importance, or in the light of a 'disclaimer' or apology, but as a matter of fact. The Letter was not, as you assert, signed 'for the Committee'! The truth is, after the Committee had approved the draft of the Address, appointed a Delegation to present it, and adjourned, an intimation was given by one or more members of the Committee, that it would be respectful and courteous to accompany the Address with a letter or note, stating that no reply was desired. The suggestion was adopted without any discussion, because it did not occur to any one, that it would be understood by Kossuth, or any one else, that he was 'advised' not to allude to Slavery in this country. These are the facts Every person will judge for himself of the motives of the Committee, and the design and effect of the letter.

There are, however, matters of more importance in your reply, that require notice. You speak of the '*hostile* secession from the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1840, their *desperate attempts to destroy that Society*, their unjustifiable *seizure* of its official organ the *Emancipator*, their efforts to *crush* the *Liberator*, and *drive us from* the field, and their endeavours to *propitiate a time-serving clergy*, and *shield* from exposure a '*corrupt church*.' Now, I boldly assert that each and all of these accusations are untrue, and I challenge you to the proof! Such things have been insinuated before, on many occasions, not only here, but abroad. It is time they were PROVED Will you do it, clearly, dispassionately, conclusively? The majority of the men who *withdrew* (*seceding* and *withdrawing* have very different meanings) did it in a peaceful, not a hostile manner; neither they or their adherents or successors have ever made any attempts to *destroy* or *injure* your Society: the old Committee did not *seize* the *Emancipator*; they never attempted to *crush* the *Liberator*, or to *drive* you or your party *from the field*; they have never endeavoured to 'propitiate a time-serving clergy,' or 'shield from exposure a corrupt church.' The allegations are altogether gratuitous and unfounded. There is not a word of truth in them; and again and with new emphasis, I call upon you to substantiate or retract them. Do not, Mr. Editor, mix up the evidence, if you think you have any, with epithets, abusive remarks, or evasive and extraneous matters, but testify, I pray you, as you would if on a witness stand, in a court of justice; 'Nothing extenuate nor set down aught in malice.'

In the old Anti-Slavery platform, it was declared to be a part of 'abolitionism' to 'encourage the labour of freemen, rather than that of the slaves, by giving a preference to their productions.' In my last communication, I recalled this to your recollection, and asked, with reference to the Society under your presidency, which you claim is composed of original and true Anti-Slavery men, 'Are they advocating the use of *free labour, produce*?' But you are wholly silent on the subject. You say, however, that 'the influences emanating from it (your Society) are moulding the political action of the country.' This, if true, does not imply that you 'spare no exertions,' to use the language of the old platform, to 'remove Slavery by moral and *political* action.' Besides, in the same *Liberator* that contains my communication and your 'Remarks,' it is said, referring to an Anti-Slavery meeting of the Old Saratoga District A. S. Society, that 'Mr. Pillsbury, (who understands your views perfectly, and who is one of the ablest of your lecturers,) went into a most powerful disquisition to exhibit the fallacy of relying on political instrumentalities to effect any great reform.' If Mr. P., delivers the sentiments you and those intimately associated with you entertain, how, I beg to know, do the influences emanating from your Society mould the political action of the country? Please explain.

You aver that the influences emanating, &c., are '*purifying* the churches, and '*stimulating* the pulpits.' Pray, Mr. Editor, tell us *how* this is done. It is thought by many, very many, that you and your associates are aiming to *break down* the pulpit and *destroy* the churches; and numberless quotations might be made to this effect from your columns. But 'purifying' and 'stimulating' include befriending and sustaining Again, the influences used, you say, are '*consolidating* public opinion against the slave system.' Your motto is, 'No union with slaveholders' or their abettors, or with churches or political parties that sympathise with, associate or act with, or who did not secede from all such parties, and you will not even tolerate anti-slavery associations that do not agree and act with you. How, then, are you 'consolidating public opinion against the slave system'? Please explain. It is true that you say, 'With whatever is truly anti-slavery in the land, we, as Abolitionists, have no controversy.' This declaration is noble, and, if acted on, would do you honor, and is deserving of imitation by all who profess to be Abolitionists. But how is it consistent with your contemptuous remark about the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society? Is this Society performing no Anti-Slavery work? Have not Jay, LeMoyne, Arthur Tappan, Jocelyn, Cornish, Pennock, Fessenden, &c., &c., anything in sentiment or action that is 'truly Anti-Slavery'? You remark, 'As an organization, they maintain a nominal existence, and give about as much uneasiness to the Slave Power as a fly does momentum to a coach wheel.' As the friends of this Society do not belong to the 'Mutual Admiration Society,' they are willing that their deeds should be found out by others, instead of trumpeting their own praises. It may not be inappropriate, however, to say, that the Society with which I am connected established the *National Era*, sustained it two years, and then surrendered it to Dr. Bailey—a paper that has seventeen thousand subscribers, and the confidence of nearly all the Abolitionists throughout the country and the world; and they might have retained it, made it their organ, and included its receipts in their annual account. Members of the Executive Committee were active in establishing, and are active in sustaining, the AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY, an Anti-Slavery association which supports nearly a hundred Anti-Slavery ministers and teachers in this country and abroad; an association whose income last year was upwards of thirty-four thousand dollars. Both the *National Era* and this Missionary Association are the offshoots of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

In evident allusion to the Society or its Committee, you say they 'cater to religious bigotry.' In what way? I demand. Look at the Reports and Resolutions of the Society, part of the latter of which are found in the columns of the *Liberator*, and see whether the accusation is supported by FACTS. On the contrary, the Society reproves a pro-Slavery church, a pro-Slavery ministry, and pro-Slavery parties, political and ecclesiastical, with all the means and the power of language they possess. If any other Society does more for the abolition of Slavery and caste, we rejoice in it, and would put no hindrance in their way. For all that you accomplish, or that is accomplished by your associates, for the benefit of the slave and the free people of color, the Society with which I am connected are truly thankful. So far from obstructing you, or desiring to do so, in what is good, they have never done it. But I refrain from enlarging, at this time, and wait for your *proofs*, IRREFRAGIBLE PROOFS, to substantiate the accusations you have brought against my associates and myself.

LEWIS TAPPAN.

——THE CENSUS PRINTING SWINDLE.—The following extract from the remarks of Mr. Smith, of Alabama, serve to show the nature of the fraud which has been attempted upon Congress and the people, in reference to printing the census:

I apprehend that it had not been maturely examined. I beg the House, for a moment, to deal with me kindly and calmly in a brief examination of the proposition to print the census of 1850, upon the enormous plan suggested by the Secretary of the Interior. Here is a plan presented as a copy. According to the estimates which I have made, under the direction of experienced gentlemen in the art of printing and publishing, if the census be printed upon this plan to the extent of 100,000 copies, it will cost nearly the sum of $1,400,000, independently of the binding.

Now, sir, in order to illustrate the magnitude of the proposition, I will advert to the letter of Mr. Rives, published some time ago in the *Globe*, in reference to the profits which he made on the printing of the last census. That gentleman, with the utmost candour, states that he received for printing the census $137,000, and that he made one hundred and twenty-five per cent. clear money on the job; that is, he made $75,000 clear profit on the job of $137,000. The same prices for printing prevail now, I suppose, that prevailed then. If, on a job of $137,000, a profit of one hundred and twenty-five per cent. was made by the printer, what would be the profit arising out of a job that would cost the Government $1,400,000? Sir, the proposition must have been made unadviasedly and without a thorough examination, and I congratulate the House on its refusal to pass the resolution. In reference to this question of printing, rejecting, as I do entirely the idea of paying a party organ out of the public money, I say that these jobs ought to be reduced to such a size that it would not be of much importance, as to profits, who did the printing. And now, as a matter of economy and justice, both to the people and to the Government, I propose to show that it is folly in the extreme to print this document on the plan proposed.

The calculation which I make, in regard to this printing, is this: Here is the census of Maryland, and there is a historical portion attached to it which costs the Government $2,400. Well, there is another portion of it, called the medical department, which is as perfectly and utterly useless as anything could be, and it will cost the Government upwards of $8,200. In order to show the utter absurdity of printing this medical part, allow me to call attention to some few items in it.

Mr. Chairman, the estimated cost of every page here is $135, supposing that one hundred thousand copies are printed upon this plan, (this quality of paper used). Every line is about the one hundredth part of this cost. The line running through an entire edition of eleven thousand pages, and one hundred thousand copies, according to the estimate each line then would swell into a cost of $12,000 or $14,000. Well, sir, here is a line [Mr. Smith here held up the page] running across this page, which states that one man died on the eastern shore of Maryland by an accident not accounted for. That line, I proclaim, if it should run through eleven thousand pages, will cost the Government $12,000 or $14,000! Here is another line running across this page, "accident by fire; one man died." Here is another, "accident by water—drowned." I now name some of the diseases of which these parties died! Here is one line, stating that one man died on the eastern shore of Maryland, of diarrhœa! Here is another line for dyspepsia, and another for dysentery; and another for gout, and another for gravel; another for hernia, another for old age, and another for worms! each to be printed at the same enormous cost! The whole thing is spread out, page after page, and repeated frequently in different locations, until it reaches twenty-three pages, for the medical statistics of the single State of Maryland! I do not say that these lines will actually run through the entire number of pages; but in the State of Maryland—as presented in this plan of one hundred and four pages—the lines to which I refer, or the most of them, actually run through twenty-six pages—one-fourth of the whole work. The lines running through the work, then, in the same proportion as to the other States, each line would cost the one-fourth of the $14,000—$3,500.

Now, in order that my remarks upon this subject may receive more attention than they would perhaps otherwise do, I beg leave to say that I know something about printing, for I have occupied almost every position in a printing-office, from devil up to editor [a laugh]. I know the phrases of printers, and the mode of their counting profits.

Mr Chairman, printers receive full pay for a page whether the impression of the types run all over it or not; the blank portion of the page is what printers call "fat," and a very good and illustrative word it is. The cost of a page is the same whether the types are there or not, because it requires the same paper and the same press work. A page having only one line on it, or totally blank, if in the body of the book, costs the same as a full and complete page of types.

There are fourteen pages of this book devoted alone to the city of Baltimore, in which the most complete nonsense is repeated for each and every ward. There are twenty wards in the city. There is one line running through four pages, stating that there is one *cage-maker* in the city, with a capital of *seventy-five dollars invested*—a most important piece of information, in which the birds, at least, must necessarily be interested. Sir, to appreciate the follies and expenses of these tables, as they are got up and spread out in this book, would require but a moment's close examination; and I cannot so well explain them as to request each member to examine the pages and tables at his room. It will be seen that the whole of the information contained in the fourteen pages referred to, could be embodied in two or three tables of one page each.

The cost, in the estimates above made, does not include the binding. If the volumes are put up in the form of the American Archieves, the cost of binding each volume would be about sixty cents. If the work should run to eleven volumes, then the cost of binding each copy would be $6,60 each. If the edition should reach one hundred thousand copies, then the cost of binding alone would be $660,000; which, added to the $1,400,000; would make the whole cost over $2,000 000

The census can be printed in a volume twice the size of the American Almanac, giving to the people all the information they desire, at the expense now sustained by Congress for printing the Patent Office Agricultural Report. That is a book of great value to the people; but if you were to send it out in large volumes like this it might never be read. I do not know the estimate cost of the Agricultural Office Reports, but I suppose that $50,000 would cover the entire expense.

——MRS. NANCY ELIZABETH CLARK received the degree of M. D. at the late Medical College Commencement at Cleveland, Ohio.

——REV. MR. LOVEJOY, of Cambridge, a brother to the Alton martyr and an ardent Freesoil politician, preached a strong sermon against the "Maine Law," on Sunday, to his own people.

——THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW IN WISCONSIN.—Reports have been presented in both branches of the Wisconsin Legislature, instructing Congressmen from that State to vote for a repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law.

——SALE OF FREE NEGROES.—In Baltimore on Saturday, four free negroes, convicted for the second time of larceny, were in accordance with the law, sold to go South, for a period of six years. They were bought by traders, two at $285, and two at $385.

——T. M BINGHAM, of Grenada, Miss., a few days since was murdered by his four slaves. After strangling him with a rope, they put the body in a sack with stones and threw it in a creek. Two of the slaves were put in jail, and afterwards taken out and hung by the mob.

——A RUNAWAY slave in Florida was recently pursued by his owner, Col. Broward, and two of Col. B.'s slaves, and on being overtaken by one of the pursuing slaves, he turned and inflicted a fatal wound upon him. The runaway was subsequently shot by Col. Broward.

——A BILL has passed both branches of the New Jersey Legislature, and become a law, appropriating $1,000 a year, for two years, to aid such coloured persons in that State as may desire to remove to Liberia, in so doing, under the direction of the New Jersey Colonization Society. The vote in the Senate was 13 to 8; in the House, 42 to 17. A very powerful speech in favour of the measure was made in the Senate by Mr. Alexander of Princeton, son of the late Rev. Dr. Alexander.

——A LIBERAL BEQUEST.—The late Mr. Holbrook, who was at the time of his death, a school trustee of the Eighteenth Ward, had bequeathed the munificent sum of $5,000 to be applied to the establishment of a library for the Free Academy. In addition to this, he left a bequest of $250 to each Ward School for the same purpose, making an aggregate of about $12,500, including the bequest to the Free Academy.

——AN AGED PENSIONER.—There is now living in Townshend, Vt., an Ethiopian woman, named Susanna Huzzey, who has attained the age of 103 years. Her husband was a slave in Massachusetts, and won his freedom by enlisting in the revolutionary service, and serving during the war. The old woman now enjoys a pension of $96 per annum, and has recently made application for bounty land, under an old statute of Massachusetts.

——THE trial of W. B. Radcliff, for the murder of David Ross, at Milwaukee, was brought to a close on Tuesday night, and at 3 o'clock on the following morning the verdict was brought into court To the infinite astonishment of the large cr

Miscellany.

[FOR THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.]

Song for the Season.

BY LUCY A. COLBY.

Come, gentle Spring, with richest verdure crowned,
And scatter opening buds and blossoms round;
Let birds make vocal every lonely wood
That long amid a frozen waste has stood,
With wild winds wailing sadly thro' its depths profound.

O! thro' the long dark wintry hours we sigh
To greet thee, and to go where blossoms lie!
Where the Arbutus, flower of earliest birth,
Lies robed in beauty all too pure for earth,
And Buttercups gleam forth like stars dropped from the sky.

For all of us are Nature's worshippers;
Our pulses echo every throb of hers;
And if, perchance, we should forget awhile—
By Pleasure lured with false, deceitful smile—
Ere long some scene of placid loveliness recurs,

Some beauty-haunted grove of flowery glen
Where we have roved in quiet gladness, when
Our hearts were young and free from every care;
Again we long to go and wander there—
Our Mother Nature wins her children back again!

March 11th, 1852.

A LOVE AFFAIR AT CRANFORD.

I am tempted to relate it, as having interested me in a quiet sort sort of way, and as being the latest intelligence of Our Society at Cranford.

I thought, after Miss Jenkyns' death, that probably my connexion with Cranford would cease; at least, that it would have to be kept up by correspondence, which bears much the same relation to personal intercourse that the books of dried plants I sometimes see ("Hortus Siccus," I think they call the thing) do to the living and fresh flowers in the lanes and meadows. I was pleasantly surprised, therefore, by receiving a letter from Miss Pole (who had always come in for a supplementary week after my annual visit to Miss Jenkyns), proposing that I should go and stay with her; and then, in a couple of days after my acceptance, came a note from Miss Matey, in which, in a rather circuitous and very humble manner, she told me how much pleasure I should confer, if I could spend a week or two with her either before or after I had been at Miss Pole's; "for," she said, "since my dear sister's death, I am well aware I have no attractions to offer; it is only to the kindness of my friends that I can owe their company."

Of course, I promised to come to dear Miss Matey, as soon as I had ended my visit to Miss Pole; and the day after my arrival at Cranford, I went to see her, much wondering what the house would be like without Miss Jenkyns, and rather dreading the changed aspect of things. Miss Matey began to cry as soon as she saw me. She was evidently nervous from having anticipated my call. I comforted her as well as I could; and I found the best consolation I could give was the honest praise that came from my heart as I spoke of the deceased. Miss Matey slowly shook her head over each virtue as it was named, and attributed to her sister; at last she could not restrain the tears which had long been silently flowing, but hid her face behind her handkerchief, and sobbed aloud.

"Dear Miss Matey!" said I, taking her hand—for indeed I did not know in what way to tell her how sorry I was for her, left deserted in the world. She put down her handkerchief, and said—

"My dear, I'd rather you did not call me Matey. *She* did not like it: but I did many a thing she did not like, I'm afraid—and now she's gone! If you please, my love, will you call me Matilda?"

I promised faithfully, and began to practise the new name with Miss Pole that very day; and, by degress, Miss Matilda's feeling on the subject was known through Cranford, and the appellation of Matey was dropped by all, except a very old woman who had been nurse in the rector's family, and had persevered, through many long years, in calling the Miss Jenkynses "the girls;" she said "Matey," to the day of her death.

My visit to Miss Pole was very quiet. Miss Jenkyns had so long taken the lead in Cranford, that, now she was gone, they hardly knew how to give a party. The Honourable Mrs. Jamieson, to whom Miss Jenkyns herself had always yielded the post of honour, was fat and inert, and very much at the mercy of her old servants. If they chose her to give a party, they reminded her of the necessity for so doing; if not, she let it alone. There was all the more time for me to hear old-world stories from Miss Pole, while she sat knitting, and I making my father's shirts. I always took a quantity of plain sewing to Cranford; for, as we did not read much, or walk much, I found it a capital time to get through my work. One of Miss Pole's stories related to the love affair I am coming to; gradually, not in a hurry, for we are never in a hurry at Cranford.

Presently, the time arrived when I was to remove to Miss Matilda's house. I found her timid and anxious about the arrangements for my comfort. Many a time, while I was unpacking, did she come backwards and forwards to stir the fire, which burned all the worse for being so frequently poked.

"Have you drawers enough, dear?" asked she. "I don't know exactly how my sister used to arrange them. She had capital methods. I am sure she would have trained a servant in a week to make a better fire than this, and Fanny has been with me four months."

This subject of servants was a standing grievance, and I could not wonder much at it; for if gentlemen were scarce, and almost unheard of in the "genteel society" of Cranford, they or their counterparts—handsome young men—abounded in the lower classes. The pretty neat servant maids had their choice of desirable "followers;" and their mistresses, without having the sort of mysterious dread of men and matrimony that Miss Matilda had, might well feel a little anxious, lest the heads of their comely maids should be turned by the joiner, or the butcher, or the gardener; who were obliged by their callings, to come to the house; and who, as ill-luck would have it, were generally handsome and unmarried. Fanny's lovers, if she had any—and Miss Matilda suspected her of so many flirtations, that, if she had not been very pretty, I should have doubted her having one—were a constant anxiety to her mistress. She was forbidden, by the articles of her engagement, to have "followers;" and though she had answered innocently enough, doubling up the hem of her apron as she spoke, "Please ma'am, I never had more than one at a time," Miss Matey prohibited that one. But a vision of a man seemed to haunt the kitchen. Fanny assured me that it was all fancy; or else I should have said myself that I had seen a man's coat-tails whisk into the scullery once, when I went on an errand into the store-room at night; and another evening, when our watches having stopped, I went to look at the clock, there was a very odd appearance, singularly like a young man squeezed up between the clock and the back of the open kitchen-door; and I thought Fanny snatched up the candle very hastily, so as to throw the shadow on the clock-face, while she very positively told me the time half-an-hour too early, as we found out afterwards by the church-clock. But I did not add to Miss Maty's anxieties by naming my suspicions, especially as Fanny said to me, the next day, that it was such a queer kitchen for having odd shadows about it, she really was almost afraid to stay; "for you know, Miss," she added, "I don't see a creature from six o'clock tea, till Missus rings the bell for prayers at ten."

However, it so fell out that Fanny had to leave; and Miss Matilda begged me to stay and "settle her" with the new maid; to which I consented, after I had heard from my father that he did not want me at home. The new servant was a rough, honest-looking country-girl, who had only lived in a farm place before; but I liked her looks when she came to be hired; and I promised Miss Matilda to put her in the ways of the house. These said ways were religiously such as Miss Matilda thought her sister would approve. Many a domestic rule and regulation had been a subject of plaintive whispered murmur, to me, during Miss Jenkyns' life; but now that she was gone, I do not think that even I, who was a favourite, durst have suggested an alteration. To give an instance: we constantly adhered to the forms which were observed, at meal times, in "my father the Rector's house." Accordingly, we had always wine and dessert; but the decanters were only filled when there was a party; and what remained was seldom touched, though we had two wine glasses apiece every day after dinner, until the next festive occasion arrived; when the state of the remainder wine was examined into, in a family council. The dregs were often given to the poor; but occasionally, when a good deal had been left at the last party (five months ago, it might be), it was added to some of a fresh bottle, brought up from the cellar. I fancy poor Captain Brown did not much like wine; for I noticed he never finished his first glass, and most military men take several. Then, as to our dessert, Miss Jenkyns used to gather currants and gooseberries for it herself, which I sometimes thought would have tasted better fresh from the trees; but then, as Miss Jenkyns observed, there would have been nothing for dessert in summer-time. As it was, we felt very genteel with our two glasses apiece, and a dish of gooseberries at the top, of currants and biscuits at the sides, and two decanters at the bottom. When oranges came in, a curious proceeding was gone through. Miss Jenkyns did not like to cut the fruit; for, as she observed, the juice all ran out nobody knew where; sucking (only I think she used some more recondite word) was in fact the only way of enjoying oranges; but then there was the unpleasant association with a ceremony frequently gone through by little babies; and so, after dessert, in orange season, Miss Jenkyns and Miss Matey used to rise up, possess themselves each of an orange in silence, and withdraw to the privacy of their own rooms, to indulge in sucking oranges.

I had once or twice tried, on such occasions, to prevail on Miss Matey to stay; and had succeeded in her sister's life-time. I held up a screen, and did not look, and, as she said, she tried not to make the noise very offensive; but now that she was left alone, she seemed quite horrified when I begged her to remain with me in the warm dining-parlour, and enjoy her orange as she liked best. And so it was in everything. Miss Jenkyns' rules were made more stringent than ever, because the framer of them was gone where there could be no appeal. In everything else Miss Matilda was meek and undecided to a fault. I have heard Fanny turn her round twenty times in a morning about dinner, just as the little hussy chose; and I sometimes fancied she worked on Miss Matilda's weakness in order to bewilder her, and to make her feel more in the power of her clever servant. I determined that I would not leave her till I had seen what sort of a person Martha was; and, if I found her trustworthy, I would tell her not to trouble her mistress with every little decision.

Martha was blunt and plain-spoken to a fault; otherwise she was a brisk, well-meaning, but very ignorant, girl. She had not been with us a week before Miss Matilda and I were astounded one morning by the receipt of a letter from a cousin of hers, who had been twenty or thirty years in India, and who had lately, as we had seen by the Army List, returned to England, bringing with him an invalid wife, who had never been introduced to her English relations. Major Jenkyns wrote to propose that he and his wife should spend a night at Cranford, on his way to Scotland—at the inn, if it did not suit Miss Matilda to receive them into her house, in which case they should hope to be with her as much as possible during the day. Of course, it must suit her, as she said; for all Cranford knew that she had her sister's bed-room at liberty; but I am sure she wished the Major had stopped in India and forgotten his cousins out and out.

"Oh! how must I manage?" asked she, helplessly. "If Deborah had been alive, she would have known what to do with a gentleman-visitor. Must I put razors in his dressing-room? Dear! dear! and I've got none. Deborah would have had them. And slippers, and coat-brushes?" I suggested that probably he would bring all these things with him. "And after dinner, how am I to know when to get up, and leave him to his wine? Deborah would have done it so well; she would have been quite in her element. Will he want coffee, do you think?" I undertook the management of the coffee, and told her I would instruct Martha in the art of waiting, in which it must be owned she was terribly deficient; and that I had no doubt Major and Mrs. Jenkyns would understand the quiet mode in which a lady lived by herself in a country town. But she was sadly fluttered. I made her empty her decanters, and bring up two fresh bottles of wine. I wished I could have prevented her from being present at my instructions to Martha; for she continually cut in with some fresh direction, muddling the poor girl's mind, as she stood open-mouthed, listening to us both.

"Hand the vegetables round," said I (foolishly, I see now—for it was aiming at more than we could accomplish with quietness and simplicity); and then, seeing her look bewildered, I added, "Take the vegetables round to people, and let them help themselves."

"And mind you go first to the ladies," put in Miss Matilda. "Always go to the ladies before gentlemen, when you are waiting."

"I'll do it as you tell me, ma'am," said Martha; "but I like lads best."

We felt very uncomfortable and shocked at this speech of Martha's; yet I don't think she meant any harm; and, on the whole, she attended very well to our directions, except that she "nudged" the Major, when he did not help himself as soon as she expected, to the potatoes, while she was handing them round.

The Major and his wife were quiet, unpretending people enough when they did come; languid, as all East Indians are, I suppose. We were rather dismayed at their bringing two servants with them, a Hindoo body-servant for the Major, and a steady elderly maid for his wife; but they slept at the inn, and took off a good deal of the responsibility by attending carefully to their master's and mistress' comfort. Martha, to be sure, had never ended her staring at the East Indian's white turban, and brown complexion, and I saw that Miss Matilda shrunk away from him a little as he waited at dinner. Indeed, she asked me, when they were gone, if he did not remind me of Blue Beard? On the whole, the visit was most satisfactory, and is a subject of conversation even now with Miss Matilda; at the time it greatly excited Cranford, and even stirred up the apathetic and Honourable Mrs. Jamieson to some expression of interest when I went to call and thank her for the kind answers she had vouchsafed to Miss Matilda's inquiries as to the arrangement of a gentleman's dressing-room—answers which I must confess she had given in the wearied manner of the Scandinavian prophetess—

"Leave me, leave me to repose!"

And *now* I come to the love affair.

It seems that Miss Pole had a cousin, once or twice removed, who had offered to Miss Matey long ago. Now, this cousin lived four or five miles from Cranford on his own estate; but his property was not large enough to entitle him to rank higher than a yeoman; or rather, with something of the "pride which apes humility," he had refused to push himself on, as so many of his class had done, into the ranks of the squires. He would not allow himself to be called Thomas Holbrook, Esq.; he even sent back letters with this address, telling the postmistress at Cranford that his name was Mr. Thomas Holbrook, yeoman. He rejected all domestic innovations; he would have the house door stand open in summer, and shut in winter, without knocker or bell to summon a servant. The closed fist or the knob of the stick did this office for him, if he found the door locked. He despised every refinement which had not its root deep down in humanity. If people were not ill, he saw no necessity for moderating his voice. He spoke the dialect of the country in perfection, and constantly used it in conversation; although Miss Pole (who gave me these particulars) added, that he read aloud more beautifully and with more feeling than any one she had ever heard, except the late Rector.

"And how came Miss Matilda not to marry him?" asked I.

"Oh, I don't know. She was willing enough, I think; but you know Cousin Thomas would not have been enough of a gentleman for the Rector, and Mrs. and Miss Jenkyns."

"Well! but they were not to marry him," said I, impatiently.

"No; but they did not like Miss Matey to marry below her rank. You know she was the Rector's daughter, and somehow they are related to Sir Peter Arly: Miss Jenkyns thought a deal of that."

"Poor Miss Matey!" said I.

"Nay, now, I don't know anything more than that he offered and was refused. Miss Matey might not like him—and Miss Jenkyns might never have said a word—it is only a guess of mine."

"Has she never seen him since?" I inquired.

"No, I think not. You, see, Woodley, Cousin Thomas' house lies half-way between Cranford and Misselton; and I know he made Misselton his market-town very soon after he had offered to Miss Matey; and I don't think he has been into Cranford above once or twice since—once, when I was walking with Miss Matey in High Street; and suddenly she darted from me, and went up Shire Lane. A few minutes after I was startled by meeting Cousin Thomas."

"How old is he?" I asked, after a pause of castle-building.

"He must be about seventy, I think, my dear," said Miss Pole, blowing up my castle, as if by gunpowder, into small fragments.

Very soon after—at least during my long visit to Miss Matilda—I had the opportunity of seeing Mr. Holbrook; seeing, too, his first encounter with his former love, after thirty or forty years separation. I was helping to decide whether any of the new assortment of coloured silks which they had just received at the shop would help to match a gray and black mousseline-de-laine that wanted a new breadth, when a tall, thin, Don Quixote-looking old man came into the shop for some woollen gloves. I had never seen the person (who was rather striking) before, and I watched him rather attentively, while Miss Matey listened to the shopman. The stranger wore a blue coat with brass buttons, drab breeches, and gaiters, and drummed with his fingers on the counter until he was attended to. When he answered the shop-boy's question, "What can I have the pleasure of showing you to-day, Sir?" I saw Miss Matilda start, and then suddenly sit down; and instantly I guessed who it was. She had made some inquiry which had to be carried round to the other shop.

"Miss Jenkyns wants the black sarcenet two-and-twopence the yard;" and Mr. Holbrook had caught the name, and was across the shop in two strides.

"Matey—Miss Matilda—Miss Jenkyns! God bless my soul! I should not have known you. How are you? how are you? He kept shaking her hand in a way which proved the warmth of his friendship; but he repeated so often, as if to himself, "I should not have known you!" that any sentimental romance which I might be inclined to build was quite done away with by his manner.

However, he kept talking to us all the time we were in the shop; and then waving the shopman with the unpurchased gloves on one side, with "Another time, Sir! another time!" he walked home with us. I am happy to say my client, Miss Matilda, also left the shop in an equally bewildered state, not having purchased either green or red silk. Mr. Holbrook was evidently full with honest, loud-spoken joy at meeting his old love again; he touched on the changes that had taken place; he even spoke of Miss Jenkyns as "Your poor sister! Well, well! we have all our faults;" and bade us good-bye with many a hope that he should soon see Miss Matey again. She went straight to her room; and never came back till our early tea-time, when I thought she looked as if she had been crying.

A few days after, a note came from Mr. Holbrook, asking us—impartially asking both of us—in a formal, old-fashioned style, to spend a day at his house—a long June day—for it was June now. He named that he had also invited his cousin, Miss Pole; so that we might join in a fly, which could be put up at this house.

I expected Miss Matey to jump at this invitation; but, no! Miss Pole and I had the greatest difficulty in persuading her to go. She thought it was improper; and was even half annoyed when we utterly ignored the idea of any impropriety in her going with two other ladies to see her old lover. Then came a more serious difficulty. She did not think Deborah would have liked her to go. This took us half a day's good hard talking to get over; but, at the first sentence of relenting, I seized the opportunity, and wrote and despatched an acceptance in her name—fixing day and hour, that all might be decided and done with.

The next morning she asked me if I would go down to the shop with her; and there, after much hesitation, we chose out three caps to be sent home and tried on, that the most becoming might be selected to take with us on Thursday.

She was in a state of silent agitation all the way to Woodley. She had evidently never been there before; and although she little dreamt i knew anything of her early story, I could perceive she was in a tremor at the thought of seeing the place which might have been her home, and round which it is probable that many of her innocent girlish imaginations had clustered. It was a long drive there, through paved jolting lanes. Miss Matilda sate bolt upright, and looked wistfully out of the windows, as we drew near the end of our journey. The aspect of the country was quiet and pastoral. Woodley stood among fields; and there was an old-fashioned garden, where roses and currant-bushes touched each other, and where the feathery asparagus formed a pretty back-ground to the pinks and gilly-flowers; there was no drive up to the door; we got out at a little gate, and walked up a straight box-edged path.

"My cousin might make a drive," I think, said Miss Pole, who was afraid of ear-ache, and had only her cap on.

"I think it is very pretty," said Miss Matey, with a soft plaintiveness in her voice, and almost in a whisper; for just then Mr. Holbrook appeared at the door, rubbing his hands in very effervescence of hospitality. He looked more like my idea of Don Quixote than ever, and yet the likeness was only external. His respectable housekeeper stood modestly at the door to bid us welcome; and, while she led the elder ladies up stairs to a bedroom, I begged to look about the garden. My request evidently pleased the old gentleman; who took me all round the place, and showed me his six-and-twenty cows, named after the different letters of the alphabet. As we went along, he surprised me occasionally by repeating apt and beautiful quotations from the poets, ranging easily from Shakspeare and George Herbert to those of our own day. He did this as naturally as if he were thinking aloud, that their true and beautiful words were the best expression he could find for what he was thinking or feeling. To be sure he called Byron "my lord Byrron," and pronounced the name of Goethe strictly in accordance with the English sound of the letters—"As Goëthe says, 'Ye ever-verdant palaces,'" &c. Altogether, I never met with a man, before or since, who had spent so long a life in a secluded and not impressive country, with ever increasing delight in the daily and yearly change of season and beauty.

When he and I went in, we found that dinner was nearly ready in the kitchen, for so I suppose the room ought to be called, as there were oak dressers and cupboards all round, all over by the side of the fire-place, and only a small Turkey carpet in the middle of the flag-floor. The room might have been easily made into a handsome dark-oak dining-parlour, by removing the oven, and a few other appurtenances of a kitchen, which were evidently never used; the real cooking-place being at some distance. The room in which we were expected to sit was a stiffly furnished, ugly apartment; but that in which we did sit was what Mr. Holbrook called the counting-house, when he paid his labourers their weekly wages, at a great desk near the door. The rest of the pretty sitting-room—looking into the orchard, and all covered over with dancing tree-shadows—was filled with books. They lay on the ground, they covered the walls, they strewed the table. He was evidently half ashamed and half proud of his extravagance in this respect. They were of all kinds, poetry, and wild weird tales prevailing. He evidently chose his books in accordance with his own tastes, not because such and such were classical, or established favourites.

"Ah!" he said, "we farmers ought not to have much time for reading; yet somehow one can't help it."

"What a pretty room!" said Miss Matey, *sotto voce*.

"What a pleasant place!" said I, aloud, almost simultaneously.

"Nay! if you like it," replied he; "but can you sit on these great black leather three-cornered chairs? I like it better than the best parlour; but I thought ladies would take that for the smarter place."

It was the smarter place; but like most things, not at all pretty, or pleasant, or homelike, so, while we were at dinner, the servant-girl dusted and scrubbed the counting-house chairs, and we sate there all the rest of the day.

We had pudding before meat; and I thought Mr. Holbrook was going to make some apology for his old-fashioned ways, for he began.

"I don't know whether you like new-fangled ways."

"Oh! not at all!" said Miss Matey.

"No more do I," said he. "My housekeeper *will* have things in her new fashion; or else I tell her, that when I was a young man, we used to keep strictly to my father's rule, 'No broth, no ball; no ball, no beef;' and always began dinner with broth. Then we had suet puddings, boiled in the broth with the beef; and then the meat itself. If we did not sup our broth, we had no ball, which we liked a deal better; and the beef came last of all, and only those had it who had done justice to the broth and the ball. Now folks begin with sweet things, and turn their dinners topsy-turvy."

When the ducks and green peas came, we looked at each other in dismay; we had only two-pronged, black-handled forks. It is true, the steel was as bright as silver; but, what were we to do? Miss Matey picked up her peas, one by one, on the point of the prongs, much as Aminé ate her grains of rice after her previous feast with the Ghoul. Miss Pole sighed over her delicate young peas as she left them on one side of her plate untasted: for they *would* drop between her prongs. I looked at my host: the peas were going wholesale into his capacious mouth, shovelled up by his large round-ended knife. I saw, I imitated, I survived! My friends, in spite of my precedent, could not muster up courage enough to do an ungenteel thing; and, if Mr. Holbrook had not been so heartily hungry, he would, probably, have seen that the good pease went away almost untouched.

After dinner, a clay pipe was brought in, and a spittoon; and, asking us to retire to another room, where he would soon join us if we disliked tobacco-smoke, he presented his pipe to Miss Matey, and requested her to fill the bowl. This was a compliment to a lady in his youth; but it was rather inappropriate to propose it as an honour to Miss Matey, who had been trained by her sister to hold smoking of every kind in utter abhorrence. But if it was a shock to her refinement, it was also a gratification to her feelings to be thus selected; so she daintily stuffed the strong tobacco into the pipe; and then we withdrew.

"It is very pleasant dining with a bachelor." said Miss Matey, softly, as we settled ourselves in the counting-house, "I only hope it is not improper: so many pleasant things are!"

"What a number of books he has!" said Miss Pole, looking round the room. "And how dusty they are!"

"I think it must be like one of the great Dr. Johnson's rooms," said Miss Matey. "What a superior man your cousin must be!"

"Yes!" said Miss Pole; "he's a great reader; but I am afraid he has got into very uncouth habits with living alone."

"Oh! uncouth is too hard a word. I should call him eccentric: very clever people always are!" replied Miss Matey.

When Mr. Holbrook returned, he proposed a walk in the fields; but the two elder ladies were afraid of damp, and dirt; and had only very unbecoming calashes to put on over their caps; so they declined; and I was again his companion in a turn which he said he was obliged to take, to see after his niece. He strode along, either wholly forgetting my existence, or soothed into silence by his pipe—and yet it was not silence exactly. He walked before me, with a stooping gait, his hands clasped behind him; and, as some tree or cloud or glimpse at distant upland pastures, struck him, he quoted poetry to himself; saying it out loud in a grand sonorous voice, with just the emphasis that true feeling and appreciation give. We came upon an old cedar-tree, which stood at one end of the house;

"More black than ash-buds in the front of March,
A cedar spread his dark-green layers of shade."

"Capital term—'layers!' Wonderful man!" I did not know whether he was speaking to me or not; but I put in an assenting "wonderful," although I knew nothing about it; just because I was tired of being forgotten, and of being consequently silent.

He turned sharp round. "Aye! you may say 'wonderful.' Why, when I saw the review of his poems in 'Blackwood,' I set off within an hour, and walked seven miles to Misselton (for the horses were not in the way), and ordered them. Now, what colour are ash-buds in March?"

Is the man going mad? thought I. He is very like Don Quixote.

"What colour are they, I say?" repeated he, vehemently.

"I am sure I don't know, sir," said I; with the meekness of ignorance.

"I knew you didn't. No more did I—an old fool that I am! till this young man comes and tells me. Black as ash-buds in March. And I've lived all my life in the country; more shame for me not to know. Black; they are jet-black, madam." And he went off again, swinging along to the music of some rhyme he had got hold of.

When we came home, nothing would serve him but that he must read us the poems he had been speaking of; and Miss Pole encouraged him in his proposal, I thought, because she wished me to hear his beautiful reading, of which she had boasted; but she afterwards said it was because she had got to a difficult part of crochet, and wanted to count her stitches without having to talk. Whatever he had proposed would have been right to Miss Matey; although she did fall sound asleep within five minutes after he began a long poem, called "Locksley Hall," and had a comfortable nap, unobserved, till he ended; when the cessation of his voice wakened her up, and she said, feeling that something was expected, and that Miss Pole was counting:

"What a pretty book!"

"Pretty! madam! it's beautiful! Pretty, indeed!"

"Oh yes! I meant beautiful!" said she, fluttered at his disapproval of her word. "It is so like that beautiful poem of Dr. Johnson's my sister used to read—I forget the name of it; what was it, my dear?" turning to me.

"Which do you mean, ma'am? What was it about?"

"I don't remember what it was about, and I've quite forgotten what the name of it was; but it was written by Dr. Johnson, and was very beautiful and very like what Mr. Holbrook has just been reading."

"I don't remember it," said he, reflectively; "but I don't know Dr. Johnson's poems well. I must read them."

As were getting into the fly to return, I heard Mr. Holbrook say he should call on the ladies soon, and inquire how they got home; and this evidently pleased and fluttered Miss Matey at the time he said it; but after we had lost sight of the old house among the trees, her sentiments towards the master of it were gradually absorbed into a distressing wonder, as to whether Martha had broken her word, and seized on the opportunity of her mistress's absence to have a "follower." Martha looked good, and steady, and composed enough, as she came to help us out; she was always careful of Miss Matey, and tonight she made use of this unlucky speech:

"Eh! dear ma'am, to think of your going out in an evening in such a thin shawl! It is no better than muslin. At your age, ma'am, you should be careful."

"My age!" said Miss Matey, almost speaking crossly, for her; for she was usually gentle, "My age!" Why, how old do you think I am, that you talk about my age?"

"Well, ma'am! I should say you were not far short of sixty; but folks' looks is often against them—and I'm sure I meant no harm."

"Martha, I'm not yet fifty-two!" said Miss Matey, with grave emphasis; for probably the remembrance of her youth had come very vividly before her this day, and she was annoyed at finding that golden time so far away in the past.

But she never spoke of any former and more intimate acquaintance with Mr. Holbrook. She had probably met with so little sympathy in her early love, that she had shut it up close in her heart; and it was only by a sort of watching, which I could hardly avoid, since Miss Pole's confidence, that I saw how faithful her poor heart had been in its sorrows and its silence.

She gave me some good reason for wearing her best cap every day, and sate near the window, in spite of her rheumatism, in order to see, without being seen, down into the street.

He came. He put his open palms upon his knees, which were far apart, as he sate with his head bent down, whistling, after we had replied to his inquiries about our safe return. Suddenly, he jumped up.

"Well, madam! have you any commands for Paris? I'm going there in a week or two."

"To Paris!" we both exclaimed.

"Yes, ma'am! I've never been there, and always had a wish to go; and I think if I don't go soon, I mayn't go at all; so as soon as the hay is got in I shall go, before harvest-time."

We were so much astonished, that we had no commissions.

Just as he was going out of the room, he turned back, with his favourite exclamation:

"God bless my soul, madam! but I nearly forgot half my errand. Here are the poems for you, you admired so much the other evening at my house." He tugged away at a parcel in his coat-pocket. "Good-bye, miss," said he; "good-bye, Matey! take care of yourself." And he was gone. But he had given her a book, and he had called her Matey, just as he used to do thirty years ago.

"I wish he would not go to Paris," said Miss Matilda, anxiously. "I don't believe frogs will agree with him; he used to have to be very careful what he ate, which was curious in so strong-looking a young man."

Soon after this I took my leave, giving many an injunction to Martha to look after her mistress, and to let me know it she thought that Miss Matilda was not so well; in which case I would volunteer a visit to my old friend without noticing Martha's intelligence to her.

Accordingly I received a line or two from Martha every now and then; and about November, I had a note to say her mistress was "very low and sadly off her food;" and the account made me so uneasy, that, although Martha did not decidedly summon me, I packed up my things and went.

I received a warm welcome, in spite of the little flurry produced by my impromptu visit, for I had only been able to give a day's notice. Miss Matilda looked miserably ill; and I prepared to comfort and cosset her.

I went down to have a private talk with Martha.

"How long has your mistress been so poorly?" I asked, as I stood by the kitchen fire.

Well! I think it's better than a fortnight; it is, I know; it was one Tuesday after Miss Pole had been that she went into this moping way. I thought she was tired, and it would go off with a night's rest; but, no! she has gone on and on ever since, till I thought it my duty to write to you, ma'am."

"You did quite right, Martha. It is a comfort to think she has so faithful a servant about her. And I hope you find your place comfortable?"

"Well, ma'am missus is very kind, and there's plenty to eat and drink, and no more work but what I can do easily—but"—Martha hesitated.

"But what, Martha?"

"Why, it seems so hard of missus not to let me have any followers; there's such lots of young fellows in the town; and many a one has as much as offered to keep company with me; and I may never be in such a likely place again, and it's like wasting an opportunity. Many a girl as I know would have 'em unbeknownst to missus; but I've given my word, and I'll stick to it; or else this is just the house for missus never to be the wiser if they did come; and it's such a capable kitchen—there's such good dark corners in it—I'd be bound to hide any one. I counted up last Sunday night—for I'll not deny I was crying because I had to shut the door in Jem Hearn's face; and he's a steady young man, fit for any girl; only I had given missus my word." Martha was all but crying again; and I had little comfort to give her, for I knew, from old experience, of the horror with which both the Miss Jenkynses looked upon "followers;" and in Miss Matey's present nervous state this dread was not likely to be lessened.

I went to see Miss Pole the next day, and took her completely by surprise; for she had not been to see Miss Matilda for two days.

"And now I must go back with you, my dear, for I promised to let her know how Thomas Holbrook went on; and I'm sorry to say his housekeeper has sent me word to-day that he hasn't long to live. Poor Thomas! That journey to Paris was quite too much for him. His housekeeper says he has hardly ever been round his fields since; but just sits with his hands on his knees in the counting-house, not reading or anything, but only saying, what a wonderful city Paris was! Paris has much to answer for, if it's killed my cousin Thomas, for a better man never lived."

"Does Miss Matilda know of his illness?" asked I; a new light as to the cause of her indisposition dawning upon me. "Dear! to be sure, yes! Has she not told you? I let her know a fortnight ago, or more, when first I heard of it. How odd, she shouldn't have told you!"

Not at all, I thought; but I did not say anything. I felt almost guilty of having spied too curiously into that tender heart, and I was not going to speak of its secrets—hidden, Miss Matey believed, from all the world. I ushered Miss Pole into Miss Matilda's drawing-room; and then left them alone. But I was not surprised when Martha came to my bed-room door, to ask me to go down to dinner alone, for that missus had one of her bad headaches. She came into the drawing-room at tea-time; but it was evidently an effort for her; and, as if to make up for some reproachful feeling against her late sister, Miss Jenkyns, which had been troubling her all the afternoon, and for which she now felt penitent, she kept telling me how good and how clever Deborah was in her youth; how she used to settle what gowns they were to wear at all the parties (faint, ghostly ideas of dim parties far away in the distance, when Miss Matey and Miss Pole were young!) and how Deborah and her mother had started the benefit society for the poor, and taught girls cooking and plain sewing; and how Deborah had danced with a lord; and how she used to visit at Sir Peter Arley's, and try to remodel the quiet rectory establishment on the plans of Arley Hall, where they kept thirty servants; and how she had nursed Miss Matey through a long, long illness, of which I had never heard before, but which I now dated in my own mind as following the dismissal of the suit of Mr. Holbrook. So we talked softly and quietly of old times, through the long November evening.

The next day Miss Pole brought us word that Mr. Holbrook was dead. Miss Matey heard the news in silence; in fact, from the account on the previous day, it was only what we had to expect. Miss Pole kept calling upon us for some expressions of regret, by asking if it was not sad that he was gone, and saying,

"To think of that pleasant day last June, when he seemed so well! And he might have lived this dozen years if he had not gone to that wicked Paris, where they are always having Revolutions."

She paused for some demonstration on our part. I saw Miss Matey could not speak, she was trembling so nervously; so I said what I really felt; and after a call of some duration—all the time of which I have no doubt Miss Pole thought Miss Matey received the news very calmly—our visitor took her leave. But the effort at self-control Miss Matey had made to conceal her feelings—a concealment she practised even with me, for she has never alluded to Mr. Holbrook again, although the book he gave her lies with her Bible on the little table by her bedside; she did not think I heard her when she asked the little milliner of Cranford to make her caps something like the Hon. Mrs. Jamieson's, or that I noticed the reply—

"But she wears widows' caps, ma'am?"

"Oh! I only meant something in that style; not widows', of course, but rather like Mrs. Jamieson's."

This effort at concealment was the beginning of the tremulous motion of head and hands which I have seen ever since in Miss Matey.

The evening of the day on which we heard of Mr. Holbrook's death, Miss Matilda was very silent and thoughtful: after prayers she called Martha back, and then she stood uncertain what to say.

"Martha!" she said at last; "you are young"—and then she made so long a pause that Martha, to remind her of her half-finished sentence, dropped a courtesy, and said—

"Yes, please, ma'am; two-and-twenty last third October, please, ma'am."

"And perhaps, Martha, you may sometime meet with a young man you like, and who likes you. I did say you were not to have followers; but if you meet with such a young man, and tell me, and I find he is respectable, I have no objection to his coming to see you once a week. God forbid!" said she, in a low voice, "that I should grieve any young hearts." She spoke as if she were providing for some distant contingency, and was rather startled when Martha made her ready eager answer—

"Please, ma'am, there's Jem Hearn, and he's a joiner, making three-and-sixpence a day, and six foot one in his stocking-feet, please ma'am; and if you'll ask about him to-morrow morning, every one will give him a character for steadiness; and he'll be glad enough to come to-morrow night, I'll be bound."

Though Miss Matey was startled, she submitted to Fate and Love.—*Dickens' Household Words.*

MRS. SARAH M. GRIMKE ON WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

Belleville, New Jersey, Feb. 10.

I thank you most cordially in the name of my sex, in the name of humanity, for the sentiments expressed in your article on the Worcester Convention. Greatly do many who are engaged in that reform need to have such views thrown before them. They feel in their inmost being that their rights are co-equal with those of their brethren; that they are forcibly restrained in the exercise of their rights; that the place allotted them is too narrow for their growth to that statue to which God designs them to attain. Hemmed in on every side, perishing for lack of intellectual culture themselves, and seeing thousands around them starving for want of food to sustain mere animal existence, they grow restive; they look round to find their oppressors, and see that those whom they have been taught to regard as protectors, whose admiration they have sought, whose praise and flattery they have won, are in possession of the fair fields of science and literature, of all the most lucrative professions and trades; that woman's labour, though equally well, or better performed, is deemed unworthy the same remuneration. They do not pause to inquire how these things have come to pass; they feel the present pressure, and, taking counsel of impatience and suffering, place themselves in a belligerent attitude, and determine to contend for their rights. This is natural; the inevitable consequence of feeling the privation of rights. But it is time to take a more enlarged, and generous, and philosophical view of this whole subject, to cease the tirade about tyranny, oppression, and wilful injustice, and soberly ask ourselves how woman came to occupy her present relative position?

In the infancy of the human race, the physical part of our being was first unfolded. Strength and prowess were the chief glory of man; hence the stronger exercised dominion over the weaker, not over the weaker *sex* only, but over all of their own sex whom they could bring into subjection. This was the natural result of the then undeveloped state of mankind. Just in proportion as man has progressed, he had lifted his foot from the neck of his victims; and just as soon as woman is prepared to fulfil the glorious destiny which awaits her, as the equal, companion, and co-labourer of man, she will find the path open before her, and none to forbid her entrance. Men are not unwilling to see woman elevated; their scruples respecting her assuming a new position in society are honest in the mass, and so soon as they see the progress and development of the human race are intimately linked with independence of thought, word, and deed, in woman, they will help her to fulfil her high vocation. I am mistaken if the pioneers in this reform do not find their sturdiest opponents in their own ranks, and almost necessarily so. As a body, women have not had the means of being as highly developed intellectually as men. They have not been accustomed to take enlarged and comprehensive views, to think for themselves, to reason out a point and form their own conclusions; but, adhering to the voice of the apostle, (which doubtless was called for in his day), they have been content to ask their "husbands, brothers, or sons" counsel, and to base their opinions upon what they might say. Hence, when such a question comes to be mooted as the equal rights of the sexes, men will be likely sooner to see its justice and the results which will follow; and I greatly overrate my brethren if they are not willing to yield to us what humanity, equity, and the good of the race imperatively call for in our day—equal rights, and equal means of development and usefulness.

Man cannot fail to see that the elevation of woman must react upon himself: that as they are *one* by the immutable laws of God, everything that produces a higher tone of character in her, that makes her an independent, thinking being, will be so much capital in his hands to improve his own intellectual and spiritual nature. He cannot fail to see that if woman has opened to her all the means of independence, of self-support, of accumulating property, that it will relieve him of an immense burden, often too heavy to bear, as the wrinkled brow and care-worn furrows testify. In what is called genteel society, multitudes of women are a dead weight upon their fathers, husbands, or brothers. I do not blame, I pity them. Education has rendered them helpless, and they drag out an existence even more miserable than belongs to those whom they oppress; the prey of ennui, because they have no object in life, no end to accomplish, no duties to fulfil. If they are young, they have a reasonable expectation that they may marry, and by this means insure a permanent living. Thousands are thus sacrificed, either by their parents or themselves, who, had they been educated in honourable independence, and been able to earn a livelihood by their own exertions, would have scorned so to violate the sacredness of those feelings which God has given as a safeguard to domestic happiness. Too much importance cannot be attached to the independence of woman. Her present dependent condition is fraught with every evil, for to act cons